University of Groningen

Fostering active citizenship in young adulthood

Slijkhuis, Edwin Gerard Jan

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.169304125](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.169304125)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2021

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Slijkhuis, E. G. J. (2021). *Fostering active citizenship in young adulthood: the predictive value of citizenship competences, socialization experiences and academic performance in adolescence*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen. <https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.169304125>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Fostering active citizenship in young adulthood

The predictive value of citizenship competences, socialization experiences
and academic performance in adolescence

Edwin Slijkhuis

Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences

Layout and (cover) design by Harma Makken Slijkhuis

Printed by Ipskamp Printing | proefschriften.net

This work was funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and was part of the Interlinked research projects of the Netherlands Initiative for Education Research (project number: 411-12-037).

Copyright © 2021 Edwin Slijkhuis

All rights reserved. No part of this thesis may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any way or by any means without the prior permission of the author.

rijksuniversiteit
 groningen

Fostering active citizenship in young adulthood

The predictive value of citizenship competences, socialization experiences
and academic performance in adolescence

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
rector magnificus prof. dr. C. Wijmenga
en volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties.

De openbare verdediging zal plaatsvinden op

donderdag 20 mei 2021 om 14.30 uur

door

Edwin Gerard Jan Slikhuis

geboren op 17 december 1987
te Epe

Promotores

Prof. dr. R.J. Bosker

Prof. dr. M.P.C. van der Werf

Copromotores

Dr. R. Maslowski

Dr. A.C. Timmermans

Beoordelingscommissie

Prof. dr. C.W.A.M. Aarts

Prof. dr. E. Claes

Prof. dr. A.B. Dijkstra

Table of contents

Chapter 1	General Introduction	7
Chapter 2	Measuring Political Participation of Young Adults <i>Development and Validation of the PAYA Inventory</i>	19
Chapter 3	The Relation between Adolescents' Citizenship Competences and Their Participation in Society as Young Adults	51
Chapter 4	The Relation between Adolescents' Socialization Experiences and their Political Participation as Young Adults	79
Chapter 5	The Relation between Adolescents' Academic Achievement and Their Participation in Society as Young Adults	103
Chapter 6	Summary and General Discussion	125
Addendum	Appendices	143
	Samenvatting (Dutch Summary)	156
	References	172
	About the Author	188
	Dankwoord (Acknowledgements)	190
	ICO Dissertation Series	194

1

General Introduction

General Introduction

Democracy is inconceivable without the political participation of citizens. Through participation in political activities, citizens express and exercise their preferences and views, thereby influencing government priorities and processes (Schlozman, Verba, & Brady, 1999). Informed and aware citizens who participate in political activities may hold the state accountable for its actions. A lack of participation undermines the representativeness of democracy, and differences in participation may result in inequalities for certain groups who do not sufficiently bring up their concerns (Dahl, 1989; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). A worrying trend is the decline of political participation, in terms of party membership and electoral turnout, faced by several western democratic societies, such as Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States (e.g., Putnam, 2000; Whiteley, 2011). This trend is most noticeable among young adults (Henn, Weinstein, & Forrest, 2005; O'Toole, Lister, Marsh, Jones, & McDonagh, 2003). Young adulthood, the age group central to this dissertation, comprises people aged 18 to 24 years old (Jekielek & Brown, 2005).

Some scholars argue that the decline in political participation of young adults results from a process of alienation from democratic institutions and being politically indifferent and apathetic (Bovens & Wille, 2008; Dalton, 2004; Kimberlee, 2002). Young adults do not feel that their concerns are (adequately) addressed by mainstream politics and politicians, and they no longer feel represented by political parties (Cammaerts, Bruter, Banjani, Harrison, & Anstead, 2014). Other scholars claim that young people are willing to participate but are turned off by the party-political structures and therefore engage in other political activities than elections and party politics (Harris, Wyn, & Younes, 2010; Henn, Weinstein, & Forrest, 2005; Norris, 2003). They argue that young people are less attracted by formal politics and are more interested in concrete activities for the benefit of society or their local community. Flanagan and Levine (2010) argue that shifts in the life cycle of young adults may further delay their political participation. The transition to adulthood is expanded as it takes longer to complete education, leave the parental home, find a stable job, and start a family (e.g., Garcia-Albacete, 2014). Only once young adults have settled down, it is argued, will they shift their focus from building up their own existence to participating in political and civic activities.

To prepare young adults for political participation, and in response to increased social tensions in society and disengagement in civic life (Kerr, 2003;

O'Toole et al., 2003; Putnam, 2000), many European countries, including the Netherlands, have encouraged or required schools to promote active citizenship (Eurydice, 2017). Active citizenship is conceived as youngsters' "participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy" (Hoskins, 2006, p. 4). The assumption of providing citizenship education at school is that young people will acquire civic competences and will become active citizens as they reach adulthood (Biesta, Lawy, & Kelly, 2009). Civic competences are conceptualized as a combination of "the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to enable individuals to become an active citizen" (Hoskins, Villalba, van Nijlen, & Barber, 2008, p. 2). In short, through citizenship education, students are assumed to develop democratic knowledge, skills and attitudes, and with these competences, they will be prepared for participation in society.

The Context of Citizenship Education in the Netherlands

Since 2006, Dutch schools have been required by law to actively promote students' citizenship and social inclusion. The underlying assumption is that students learn about the democratic constitutional state and practice democracy inside and outside school. School is considered a suitable context for teaching young people civic competences. Schools aim to ensure that young people become active citizens at a later age. Studies indicate that a targeted curriculum (Geboers, Geijssel, Admiraal, & ten Dam, 2013) and an open climate within schools, with positive relations among students and between teachers and students (Wanders, 2019), can contribute to students' involvement in society, although results about the effect of schools on students' active citizenship are not unequivocal (Isac, Maslowski, Creemers, & van der Werf, 2013; Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy, & Lopes, 2010).

Before the introduction of citizenship education, Dutch schools were already obliged to pay attention to some general core aims, set by the Ministry of Education and evaluated by the Inspectorate of Education, of which some were related to the content of citizenship education. An example of such a core aim is: "students should learn in general terms how the Dutch political system functions as a democracy, and how people might become involved in political processes in different ways" (Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, 2010, p. 4). In practice, in primary and lower secondary education these core aims are mainly addressed in the subjects of 'history' and 'geography'. In upper-secondary education, they are addressed in the one-year compulsory subject 'social studies'.

In the Netherlands, citizenship education has no well-defined curriculum. From the start in 2006, Dutch schools have been autonomous in the design and choice of their own citizenship education programs.¹ This autonomy leads to differences in the practice of citizenship education between schools. It can be a separate subject, a cross-curricular subject, or part of extracurricular activities, such as an individual project that schools offer to their students involving decision-making at school (student council, participation council), school elections, fundraising projects, or debating groups (Maslowski & van der Werf, 2013).

Ten years after the introduction of citizenship education, an evaluation by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education revealed that concrete learning objectives to promote civic competences were lacking, and that most schools did not keep track of their students' learning outcomes for citizenship education (Inspectorate of Education, 2018). The inspectorate indicated: "there have been concerns for years about the level of knowledge and skills being acquired by pupils and students, but still there is no clear, widely shared educational mission in this domain" (Inspectorate of Education, 2018, p. 6). Recently, there has been draft legislation from the Ministry of Education, and at the same time, stakeholders in the field of citizenship education have proposed a new curriculum.² Both of these moves are aimed at strengthening citizenship education in the Netherlands.

The civic competences of Dutch students in grade 8 lag behind what is expected or aspired by Dutch education policy (Inspectorate of Education, 2018). Although the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) showed that the level of citizenship knowledge of 14-year-old Dutch students equals the international average (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, Agrusti, & Friedman, 2017), Dutch adolescents score lower than their peers in neighboring countries, like Belgium (Flanders) and Scandinavian countries (Munniksma et al., 2017). Furthermore, large differences are reported in citizenship competences between subgroups of Dutch students (Maslowski, van der Werf, Oonk, Naayer, & Isac, 2012; Munniksma et al., 2017). Students in the vocational tracks have considerably less civic knowledge compared to students in the two academic tracks³, and this gap widened between 2009 and 2016 (Munniksma et al., 2017). Moreover, students

1 There was a temporarily exception: the formal obligation for secondary schools to offer a 40-hour community service program between 2011 and 2015.

2 Curriculum.nu, retrieved from: <https://www.curriculum.nu/voorstellen/burgerschap/>

3 At the age of 12, students in the Netherlands are selected for an educational track.

from families with lower educated parents generally have less civic knowledge and have less positive attitudes toward equal rights for different ethnic groups and for men and women when compared with students with higher educated parents (Maslowski et al., 2012; Munniksmma et al., 2017).

Finally, for the context of this dissertation, it is noteworthy that Dutch students in the academic tracks of secondary education, despite being willing to participate in politics are, overall and compared to their peers in Scandinavian countries, less likely to vote and participate in society (Munniksmma et al., 2017). Furthermore, they consider the classroom climate less receptive to discuss social issues and take part in fewer citizenship education initiatives than their peers in Northwestern Europe.

The Concept of Participation in Society

In this dissertation, participation in society is conceptualized by referring to two dimensions: civic participation and political participation. This conceptual distinction of civic and political participation is maintained throughout the remainder of the dissertation.

Civic participation refers to “the participation of a citizen in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community’s future” (Adler & Goggin, 2005, p. 241). Civic participation therefore refers to activities that are focused on helping others, and that are not targeted at politics. Examples of such activities are volunteering, helping others or donating money to charity (Zukin et al., 2006). By contrast, political participation refers to “voluntary activity by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state” that is “neither restricted to specific phases (such as policy making, or the input side of the political system) nor to specific levels (such as national elections or contacts with public representatives)” (van Deth, 2014, p.352–354). Political participation is further divided into two subtypes: conventional and unconventional participation (Barrett & Zani, 2015). The first type, conventional political participation, falls within the scope of the electoral process and representative democracy (e.g., voting, campaigning, and contacting politicians). The second type, unconventional political participation, is located outside the electoral process and institutions of representative democracy (e.g., signing petitions, demonstrating, and boycotting) (cf. Linssen, Scheepers, te Grotenhuis, & Schmeets, 2018; Pachi & Barrett, 2012; van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009).

It is important to highlight these two subtypes of political participation, because a transformation of conventional political activities to more unconventional ones has been identified (Li & Marsh, 2008; O'Toole, 2015). Nowadays, loosely structured, unconventional political activities provide young people with the informal platform to participate (Hustinx, Meijs, Handy, & Cnaan, 2011), thereby focusing on specific issues and policy concerns (Norris, 2003), such as climate change, gay rights, global poverty, and racism. Digital media have added a plethora of new ways to participate in political activities and it is a challenge to integrate these in political participation studies (Theocharis, 2015).

Research Aim and Questions

The main aim of this dissertation is *to study the long-term associations between adolescents' civic and citizenship competences and their actual political and civic participation in young adulthood*, thereby estimating which civic competences were important for which forms of participation. Considering the rationale of citizenship education this is an important endeavor, as it focuses on the effect of secondary school students' civic competences on participation in society and active citizenship seven years later.

So far, studies investigating the association between civic competences and participation in society were mainly cross-sectional in nature, captured only a short time span, and were focused on the intention to participate in later life, instead of on actual participation (Cohen & Chaffee, 2012; Manganelli, Lucidi, & Alivernini, 2014; Pasek, Feldman, Romer, & Jamieson, 2008; Quintelier & Hooghe, 2011; Torney-Purta, 2002). Through the follow-up of students of the Dutch sample of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009 (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010), a longitudinal panel study with a wide time span was conducted. In the ICCS 2009 study, Grade 8 students, who were approximately 14 years old at that time, completed a civic knowledge test and questionnaire. Seven years later these same students were invited to take part in a semi-structured interview about their actual participation in society.

In this dissertation, the outcomes of citizenship education in terms of political and civic participation in early adulthood are studied. Research so far has barely captured these outcomes beyond secondary education (Keating, Benton, & Kerr, 2011). Only recently have studies based on longitudinal data indicated the positive relationship between citizenship education and political behavior of young adults who have completed secondary education (Keating & Janmaat, 2016; Neundorff, Niemi, & Smets, 2016). This dissertation aims first to determine whether students'

civic competences predict their political and civic participation as young adults. This can provide some insight into whether the development of civic competences pays off in the long term, by fostering active citizenship of young adults. A second aim is to consider the impact of two potential alternative predictors of young adults' political and civic participation, namely features of socialization experiences and general academic performance. This together provides an overview of the extent to which these two other factors might offer alternative explanations for young adults' participation in society.

Before addressing the longitudinal relation between civic competences of young adolescents and their later participation in society, this dissertation starts with an account of the development of the Political Activities of Young Adults (PAYA) instrument to measure political participation among young adults. Political research from the last decades indicates a decline in voter turnout, membership of political parties, and other forms of conventional political participation among young adults (Fieldhouse, Tranmer, & Russell, 2007). But, young adults participate in other ways, for instance via online social networks, public demonstrations, and boycotting products (Dalton 2008; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). Many of these unconventional political activities that young adults engage in are focused on specific issues and policy concerns (Norris, 2003), which are not included in existing instruments of political participation (see Albacete, 2014; Manning & Edwards, 2014; O'Toole, 2015). This implies that young people have a broader repertoire of unconventional political participation than captured in available instruments. Hence, these former instruments (mostly aimed at adults) are not suitable in a study on political participation among young adults. Therefore, a new instrument was developed in this study to accurately measure conventional and unconventional ways of political participation of young adults. The first research objective was:

1. The development of an instrument for measuring political participation among young adults that meets the psychometric requirements of scalability, reliability and validity.

Whether civic competences will lead to young adults being more prone to participation in society has been the subject of many studies (e.g., Bengtsson & Christensen, 2014; Castillo, Miranda, Bonhomme, Cox, & Bascopé, 2015; Feldman, Pasek, Romer, & Jamieson, 2007; Magnanelli, Lucidi, & Alivernini, 2014). This has, for instance, resulted in the finding that the more politically knowledgeable young adults are, and the more they feel capable of participating, the more likely they are to engage in political activities (Cho & McLeod, 2007; Galston, 2001; Verba et al., 1995). A major part of all these studies, however, are cross-sectional by nature or based on a small time span, and are focused on the relationship between students' civic competences and their intention to participate politically in later life, instead of their actual political participation. It is not yet clear whether the standard measure of students' intended participation has sufficient predictive value for actual participation in young adulthood (Hooghe & Wilkenfeld, 2007; Persson, 2012). Recently, there is an indication that the intentions of adolescents to participate and their actual participation two to three years later are only weakly related (Quintelier & Blais, 2016). The former implies that there is, to say the least, no overwhelming evidence that adolescents' intentions to participate in political activities will actually result in political participation later in life, especially when it concerns the period after leaving secondary school (Keating et al., 2011). Moreover, previous studies used rather broad measurements of participation in society, which is problematic because the influence of civic competences and active participation in extracurricular civic activities might well be different for future political participation than for future civic participation (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007; Manning & Edwards, 2014). This indicates that it is important to conceptually distinguish participation in political and civic types, which makes it possible to examine how these forms are influenced by different factors. For instance, positive relationships between students' civic knowledge, support for democratic values, political efficacy and attitudes toward duty-based and engaged citizenship (i.e. expectations about the role of citizens in politics and society) and political participation can be expected. The relationship between these civic competences and civic participation is less clear, as this has, to our knowledge, not yet been fully studied.

As was stated at the beginning of this section, the main aim of the dissertation was to study the long-term associations between students' civic competences (when they were approximately 14 years old) and their actual political and civic participation in young adulthood (approximately 21 years old). Controlling for effects of socioeconomic status, religious affiliation and gender,

the following research question was examined:

2. To what extent is the political and civic participation of young adults predicted by their civic and citizenship competences as adolescents?

To examine the association between civic competences and actual participation in the broader context, two alternative potential predictors for the future political and civic participation of young adolescents were examined. These alternative predictors were their socialization experiences in early adolescence (research question 3) and their level of academic achievement when they were in Grade 11 or 12 of secondary school (research question 4).

From the first alternative predictor, it can be inferred that other socialization experiences might (also) provide adolescents with the knowledge, interest, trust and network (sources of social capital) that enables them to become active citizens. The four important arenas, next to schools, where socialization and learning takes place are the family, peers, the media, and voluntary associations (Amnå, 2012). Parents play a crucial role in the development of civic values, knowledge and behavior of their children (Jennings, Stoker, & Bowers, 2009). The first discussions and experiences with politics usually take place within the family context (Quintelier, 2013). Political communication within the family and with peers seems to be beneficial for the participation in society of young adults (Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, & Keeter, 2003; McDevitt & Kioussis, 2007). As adolescents grow older, they detach from their family to a certain extent and peers become more important for political socialization (Dostie-Goulet, 2009). In late adolescence, political discussion among peers is more strongly related to political outcomes in comparison with political discussion with parents (Ekström & Östman, 2013; Wanders, 2019), and access to media is also linked with more political participation (Moeller & de Vreese, 2013; Serek & Umemura, 2015). The media provide political information and are used for participation itself (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011). Furthermore, early involvement of adolescents in voluntary associations leads to more participation in society in early adulthood (McFarland & Thomas, 2006). Children develop a habit of being active in these voluntary organizations and build a circle of friends that can mobilize them for political-oriented activities (van Ingen & van der Meer, 2016).

To determine the influence of socialization experiences in early adolescence, the effects of political discussions with parents and friends, the use of media to obtain information on social and political issues, and adolescents' self-reported involvement

in voluntary associations were examined. Ratings of the open classroom climate, and indicators of educational level, socioeconomic status and religious affiliation were used to control for effects of schooling and relevant student background characteristics. The research question addressing the impact of early adolescents' socialization experiences on their political and civic participation later on was:

3. To what extent is the political participation of young adults predicted by their socialization experiences during adolescence?

The second potential alternative predictor for students' future political and civic participation was students' general level of educational achievement. Numerous studies reveal that highly educated persons participate more frequently in political and civic activities than less educated persons (Putnam, 2000; Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). Scholars argue that general education not only enhances cognitive capacity and civic competences (Eidhof, ten Dam, Dijkstra, & van de Werfhorst, 2016; Hauser, 2000), but also influences political interest and political efficacy; and all these factors are important in political and civic participation (Campbell, 2006; Verba et al., 1995). Most studies that underline the importance of education for participation in society rely on crude measures like 'years of education' (Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980), 'high school graduation' (Milligan, Moretti, & Oreopoulos, 2004; Sondheimer & Green, 2010), or 'college graduation' (Burden, 2009). What these measures have in common is that they do not account for the educational content and achievement within school (Condon, 2015). Instead, the general knowledge and skills that are taught in schools are considered to be more important to facilitate learning about politics and society, and are therefore potentially more important predictors of political and civic participation than such crude measures (Condon, 2015; Hillygus, 2005; Muller & Kogan, 2010). The acquired knowledge and skills in secondary school are generally assessed in final examinations. To examine the importance of students' general academic achievement for their future political and civic participation, we focused on standardized grades for three compulsory core subjects in the Dutch central examinations, which can be compared across schools. Controlling for effects of relevant student background characteristics from previous chapters and civic competences, the research question was:

4. To what extent is the political and civic participation of young adults predicted by their academic achievement in secondary school?

Outline of the Dissertation

In Chapter 2, the development and validation of the Political Activities of Young Adults instrument to map conventional and unconventional forms of young adults' political participation is described. This instrument is then used in the other empirical chapters of the dissertation. Chapter 3 focuses on the relationship between students' citizenship competences and their participation in society as young adults. Specifically, the association between students' civic knowledge, civic attitudes, civic values and civic and later political participation is explored.

Next, two potential alternative predictors for students' future political and civic participation are examined. Chapter 4 describes the influence of socialization experiences—in the family, with peers, with the media and in voluntary associations—on young adults' participation in society. Chapter 5 shifts the attention to the influence of academic achievement of students. Here, the association between students' grades in Mathematics, English, and Dutch language at the end of secondary school and their later participation in society is studied, controlling *inter alia* for the effect of civic competences.

Chapter 6 summarizes the main findings, discusses the answers to the research questions and implications of the findings in light of the limitations of the research, and provides suggestions for further research into the long-term effects of citizenship education.

2

Measuring the Political Participation of Young Adults

Development and Validation of the PAYA Inventory

Abstract

This chapter aims at the development of a new instrument to map young adults' political participation as well as the validation of the instrument on a sample of Dutch young adults. Existing instruments on political participation only partly address unconventional political participation of young adults, do not adequately account for online forms of political participation, or are not directed toward young adults between 18 and 25 years old. The results of this study indicate that the PAYA inventory, consisting of two scales of political participation, meets the psychometric requirements of scalability, reliability and construct validity. It addresses both conventional and unconventional forms of participation and captures the political activities young adults are engaged in, both physically and online.

Introduction

The disengagement of young people in political issues has been a major concern of both scholars and politicians over the past decades (Blais, Gidengil, Nevitte, & Nadeau, 2004; Putnam, 2000). Studies indicate a withdrawal of young people from the formal political domain, such as the electoral process and party membership (Dalton, 2008; Henn, Weinstein, & Forrest, 2005; Kimberlee, 2002). Declining voter turnout and diminishing numbers of political party membership may, however, not tell the whole story (e.g., Henn & Foard, 2012), as young adults may be politically engaged in various other ways, for example via social networks, public demonstrations, and boycotting products (Dalton, 2008; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). Current instruments to measure political participation, however, do not seem to have evolved to capture the changing repertoire of young people's political behavior (see Albacete, 2014; Manning & Edwards, 2014; O'Toole, 2015).

Contemporary political participation includes certain activities that did not exist ten or twenty years ago. Van Deth (2014) argues that expansion of the political repertoire in the last decade can be attributed to targeted political activities outside the sphere of government. With these activities, citizens address political problems, for instance via signing email petitions, spontaneous organization of protests and participation in social media platforms. Posting political comments on Facebook, writing blogs and buying fair trade products are all to be regarded as politically motivated actions (Hosch-Dayican, 2014). It is precisely these more personalized political—and often digital—activities of young adults that are missing from the existing accounts of political participation in many questionnaires and inventories.

Over the past decade, this type of non-formal political participation has been termed 'non-institutional' (Marien, Hooghe & Quintelier, 2010), 'non-electoral' (Dalton, 2008), 'cause-oriented' (Norris, 2003), 'emerging' (Stolle & Hooghe, 2011), 'expressive' (Östman, 2013) or 'extra-parliamentary' (Ekman & Amna, 2012). Teorell, Torcal and Montero (2007) identified five types of political participation, consisting of party activity, voting, contacting, protest activity, and consumer participation, of which the latter two can be interpreted as non-formal forms of political participation. Although others (e.g., Ekman & Amna, 2012; Norris, 2001; Newton & Giebler, 2008; Parry et al., 1992; Verba & Nie, 1972; Verba et al., 1995) proposed classification of three to five types of political participation, each of

these classifications essentially reflects two basic categories: conventional versus unconventional political participation (see Linssen, Schmeets, Scheepers, & te Grotenhuis, 2014).

The first form, conventional political participation, comprises electoral process and representative democracy. It concerns “voluntary activities by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state” (van Deth, 2014, p. 354), and covers traditional forms of political participation such as voting, working for political parties, and contacting politicians (cf. Barnes & Kaase, 1979). The second form, unconventional political participation, is outside the electoral process and institutions of representative democracy, and is directed toward actors in the government or in the non-profit or private sectors (cf. Inglehart & Catterberg, 2002; Norris, 2003). Despite the underrepresentation of unconventional political activities in many inventories for assessing political participation, the term has a long history—it was introduced in the 1960s and became widely known in the late 1970s through the work of Barnes and Kaase (1979). As unconventional political activities, such as signing petitions, have become generally accepted and widespread since then (Dalton, 2008; Inglehart & Catterberg, 2003; Lamprianou, 2013), several more recent studies have adopted the term— next to conventional political participation—for investigating political participation among late adolescents and young adults (Albanesi, Zani, & Cicognani, 2012; Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Quintelier, 2008).

Moreover, current questionnaires and inventories do not adequately capture many of the online political activities young adults take part in (see Albacete, 2014; Manning & Edwards, 2014; O’Toole, 2015). Recent research indicates that late adolescents and young adults are particularly involved in social media and associated types of political participation (Xenos, Vromen, & Loader, 2014). Online participation has certain advantages for young adults, such as great accessibility and low costs in terms of resources (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011). Online participation encompasses both conventional and unconventional types, as for both types certain offline activities are reemerging online, such as signing petitions, contacting politicians or boycotting products (Gibson & Cantijoch, 2013). Online participation is not so much an isolated type but rather a different mode of political participation. It is, for that reason, a broadening of the various activities young adults may engage in, encompassing both conventional and unconventional types of political participation.

Aim of the Current Study

The current study is aimed at both the development of a new instrument to map conventional and unconventional forms of young adults' political participation as well as the validation of the instrument on a sample of young Dutch adults. In the following section, we first determine the usability of existing instruments and discuss their shortcomings in measuring the full range of participatory behavior of young adults. Thereafter, we describe the choices and decisions that were made regarding the items to be included in the new instrument, the Political Activities of Young Adults (PAYA) inventory, which we will present at the end of this section. For the inventory, items from current validated questionnaires are used, to which recent political participation activities are added. The remaining part of this chapter is about the study aimed at the assessment of the psychometric quality and validity of the instrument, through which three research questions will be answered:

1. To what extent is the new instrument for political participation scalable and reliable?
2. To what extent does the instrument measure the constructs of conventional and unconventional political participation?
3. To what extent are the constructs of conventional and unconventional participation related to traditional predictors of political participation and to relevant background characteristics?

Review of Instruments on Political Participation

Before constructing the inventory, existing instruments for measuring political participation among young adults were identified. The search was specifically focused on instruments that met the following criteria. First, the instrument had to be directed at actual political participation. Second, the instrument had to be validated, and third, the instrument had to be applicable for the age category of young adults (18 to 25 years old).

The following search terms or combinations were used: ('political acti*' OR 'political part*') AND ('validat*') AND ('inventory' OR 'instrument' OR 'questionnaire' OR 'survey'). A search was conducted in the following databases: SocIndex ($N = 16$), ERIC ($N = 8$), Web of Science – Social Science Citation Index ($N = 178$). The search period was set from 1990 to 2015. Additionally, in Google Scholar a search was conducted for 'political participation' and at least one of the following words:

‘young’, ‘inventory’, ‘instrument’, and ‘questionnaire’. This search resulted in 331 hits. Removing double hits, around 300 unique studies remained.

Subsequently, only studies were selected for further analysis that used a battery of items for measuring political participation, resulting in 26 studies. To narrow down the 26 studies, further selection criteria were used, including acknowledging dimensionality (i.e., different aspects) of political participation, attempted validation and public awareness of the instrument. Eight studies treated participation as one summative index based on eight to eleven items, reported with a Cronbach’s alpha (Cohen, Vigoda, & Samorly, 2001; de Zúñiga, Veenstra, Vraga, & Shah, 2010; Hargittai & Shaw, 2013; Persson & Solevid, 2014; Quintelier & Vissers, 2007; Theocharis, 2011; Vecchione & Caprara, 2009; Yamamoto, Kushin, & Dalisay, 2013), and six studies were based on exploratory factor analysis (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Persson, 2012; Quintelier, 2008; Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012; Nygård, 2009; Theocharis & Quintelier, 2014). Three studies distinguished fewer than eight political activities (Berry, Rodgers & Dear, 2007; McFarland & Thomas, 2006; Moreno-Jiménez, Ríos Rodríguez & Vallejo Martín, 2013), and three studies relied on three to five political participation items developed for well-known large-scale studies: the European Social Survey (Neuфеind, Jiranek, & Wehner, 2013), the World Values Survey (Inglehart & Catterberg, 2002) or the International Social Survey Programme (Martin, 2012).

In Table 1, the remaining six studies are characterized in terms of dimensions or scales, reliability and validity. The dimensions or scales measured in these instruments that correspond to the two previously defined concepts of conventional and unconventional political participation are presented in bold text in Table 1.

Table 1
Instruments on Political Participation

Name of the instrument & Study	Sample characteristics & Size	Scales and subscales ^a	Format & Example item	Reliability	Construct validity	Convergent validity
<i>Participatory behavior scale</i>	Adults (Italian) Mean age: 35.63	Participatory behavior <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disengagement• Civil participation• Formal participation• Activism	Yes/no Can you indicate to what extent you recognize these behaviors as your behavior?	Cronbach: .78 (formal political) and .71 (activism)	Four factors; Confirmatory Factor Analysis= CFI: .96, TLI: .95, RMSEA: .05, SRMR: .04	Moderate bivariate correlations with political efficacy (.35) and educational level (.15 to .20)
Taló & Mannarini (2015)	Sample size (1): 566 Sample size (2): 680	16 items in total (4 per scale)				
<i>Online/Offline participation</i>	Young adults (Dutch) Mean age: 19.2	Political participation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Politics• Activism• Sharing• Consumption	5-point scale, ranging from never to very often. They were asked to indicate how often they participated in activities in the past 12 months	Cronbach: .65 (politics), .71 (activism), .85 (consumption), .70 (sharing)	Four factors; Confirmatory Factor Analysis= CFI: .901; PCFI: .609; RMSEA: .078	Correlations among three factors are strong (.77 to .85), except for 'consumption'
Hirzalla & van Zoonen (2011)	Sample size: 808	14 items in total (3 to 4 per scale)				

Table 1 (continued)

Name of the instrument & Study	Sample characteristics & Size	Scales and subscales ^a & No. of items	Format & Example item	Reliability	Construct validity	Convergent validity
<i>Youth Inventory of Involvement</i>	High school students from Canada	Youth involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Political• Community• Passive• Helping	Likert-scales: 0 (never did this over the previous year) to 4 (did this a lot over the previous year)	Four factors; Cronbach: .90 (total scale)		Correlation of the total scale with Youth Social Responsibility Scale. wave one: .33 wave two: .22
Pancer et al. (2007)	mean age: wave one:17.5 wave two: 19.3	30 items in total (7 items in political subscale)	Participation in activities over the previous year	Test-retest (2 years period) correlation: .58 Political activity: 7 items Cronbach: wave one: .78 , wave two: .73		
<i>EUYOUPART measurement</i>	Young adults (15-to 25 years; from 8 European countries)	Political Participation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conventional• Unconventional	Yes/no	Unknown	Hierarchical Cluster Analysis for functional equivalence between countries (presented in dendograms); aiming at largest similarity between single country and full data set	Small to moderate correlations between belief in effectiveness and actual political participation (.10 to .40).
Ogris & Westphal (2005)	Sample size: 3,468	24 items (2 to 8 items per subscale)	'Have you ever done any of the following activities?'		Five clusters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work for elections• Illegal• Information work• Political consumption• Protest	

Table 1 (continued)

Name of the instrument & Study	Sample characteristics & Size	Scales and subscales ^a & No. of items	Format & Example item	Reliability	Construct validity	Convergent validity
<i>Core indicators of Engagement</i>	Adults (aged 15 and older, from the USA)	Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Civic• Electoral• Political voice	Yes/no	total scale: Cronbach: .76.		Moderate correlations with educational level and political interest
Keeter et al. (2002)	Sample size: 3,246	In the past 12 months, ...have you done any of the following activities? (5 items in electoral and 9 items in Political Voice)		Exploratory factor analysis: three factors. Bivariate correlations among the three factors are moderate (.30 to .43)		
				Reliability factors: Unknown		
<i>Political participation</i>	Adults (from 25 European countries)	Political participation	Yes/no	Originally larger battery of items, reduced to 7 items, based on psychometrics and efficiency	In Vettehen et al. (2017) 5 items formed a Mokken scale, <i>H</i> : .37	Unknown
<i>European Social Survey; Thomassen (2001)</i>	Mean age: 50.54 Sample size: 40,582	7 items	During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following activities?			

Note. Bold subscales correspond to the conceptualization of political participation.

Talô and Mannarini (2015) developed the *Participatory Behavior Scale (PBS)*. Among other constructs, the *PBS* is directed toward measuring formal participation (conventional political participation) and activism (unconventional political participation), and these two forms appeared to be strongly correlated ($r = .57$). The instrument comprises several useful items on especially conventional political participation, such as ‘votes in elections or referenda’, ‘runs for public office’, ‘donates money to a party or a political organization’, or ‘member of a party or political organization’. In terms of psychometric quality, the *PBS* is one of the most extensively tested of the six instruments that are discussed in this section (e.g., Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) in a second sample). Since the conceptualization of participatory behavior in this instrument is much broader than the area of politics, the instrument as a whole is not suited to measuring conventional and unconventional political participation of young adults. Additionally, the political activities referred to in the items were not specifically targeted at young adults, as online political participation items were absent.

The second selected instrument was used in a Dutch study on online and offline political participation among young adults between 15 and 25 years old (Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011). The goal of this study was to merge offline and online activities of young adults in four predetermined forms of political participation. The study showed that online activities are an essential part of the conceptualization and repertoire of political participation, such as signing online petitions, visiting websites, forwarding e-mails, working on one’s own website about politics, and discussing on online forums. The 14 items of this instrument covered both conventional and unconventional political participation. The authors divided unconventional political participation into three forms: activism, sharing and consumption. While the constructs of activism and consumption fit within the concept of unconventional political participation, sharing refers to discussions on civic issues with family, friends and colleagues. CFA indicated that the model with the four forms of political participation fits the data. Correlations among conventional political participation, activism and sharing were strong ($r = .77$ to $.85$), whereas consumption was not significantly correlated with the other forms. However, the elaboration of the four modes of participation into corresponding activities makes the instrument as such unsuitable for our study, given the strong correlations between three of the four modes of participation, and the items (e.g., visiting a public event) that cannot be considered as indicators of political

participation as such. Moreover, as an instrument with only three items, it covers just a limited number of conventional political activities.

The third instrument, the Youth Inventory of Involvement (Pancer, Prarr, Hunsberger, & Alisar, 2007), was developed to measure community and political participation of late adolescents (16 to 19 year olds). Hierarchical cluster analysis was used to create four clusters of activities. Seven items concerning political activities were presented as a subscale of the instrument, but data concerning the validity of the subscale was not reported (only for the total scale of 30 items). Examining the items in the subscale in more detail reveals that unconventional political activities of this specific age group (e.g., online activism and political consumerism) are not covered, possibly due to a limited number of items in these subscales, and therefore the instrument as such was not considered satisfactory in this respect. The following items on traditional, conventional political participation were deemed suitable for inclusion: ‘participating in a political party or organization’, ‘contacting a public official (by phone)’, and ‘worked on a political campaign’.

The fourth instrument was developed as part of a comparative research project on political participation in eight European countries, EUYOUNGPART (Ogris & Westphal, 2005). This instrument was aimed at young people, aged 15 to 25. The 24-item instrument distinguishes conventional political participation (voting and party work), and unconventional political participation (political consumerism, political discourse, political protest and illegal/violent forms). The content of the instrument covered an extensive range of political activities. Specifically, activities concerning political discourse (‘held a political speech’, ‘contributed to a political discussion on the internet’, ‘written or forwarded a letter with a political content’, ‘attended a public meeting dealing with political or social issues’, ‘written an article’) and illegal/violent protest activities (‘participated in an illegal demonstration’, ‘occupied houses/school/university buildings/factories or government offices’, ‘blocked streets or railways’) were considered as useful for the operationalization of unconventional political participation in the new instrument for young adults’ political participation. The focus in the development of the instrument was on measurement equivalence between European countries of the types of political participation, and therefore incomparable political activities (eight items) were excluded. It is interesting to note that in the final scale, seven of the 16 items represented illegal protest behavior, activities that are very rarely performed in Northwestern Europe (Quaranta, 2013). Concerning the validity of the

instrument, only correlations between beliefs on the effectiveness of the political activities with actual political participation were reported. Generally, positive correlations were found that supported the assumption that belief in effectiveness increases political participation. Other statistics on the convergent validity and reliability of the instrument were not provided.

The fifth instrument is based on a questionnaire measuring civic and political behavior, consisting of 19 items, developed by Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, and Jenkins (2002) for the context of the United States. It is targeted at young people, aged 15 to 25, and is almost equivalent in content to the previously described EUYOPART instrument, except for the illegal and violent forms of political participation. The instrument covers six activities of conventional and eight activities of unconventional political participation (Zukin et al., 2006). Next to these constructs, the questionnaire also measures community participation with five items. Relevant political participation items for young adults in the instrument, which did not feature extensively in the discussion of previous instruments, are: ‘contacting the media’, ‘canvassing’, ‘participating in written petitions’, and ‘participating in e-mail petitions’. A few other items were specific to the U.S. context and therefore cannot be used elsewhere in their exact formulation (e.g., ‘donating money to a campaign’, ‘called a talkshow’). Furthermore, the instrument focused exclusively on offline political activities, thereby potentially missing a great deal of political activities in the online sphere.

The sixth and last instrument was used in the European Social Survey (ESS; Thomassen, 2001). The ESS is targeted at an adult population (15 years and older). The instrument covered both forms of conventional and unconventional political participation (four conventional political items: ‘wear or display a campaign badge/sticker’, ‘work in a political party or action group’, ‘work in another organization or association’, and ‘contact a politician or (local) government official’; and three unconventional political items: ‘sign a petition’, ‘take part in a lawful public demonstration’, and ‘boycott certain products’). The first five items formed a general political participation scale (Vettehen, Troost, Boerboom, Steijaert, & Scheepers, 2017), containing both conventional and unconventional political activities. The ESS instrument was also part of another adult survey, the Civic, Involvement and Democracy (CID) survey (Howard, Gibson, & Stolle, 2007). The CID survey used the seven items of ESS (in exact replications) and added three items with regard to online conventional political participation: ‘visit websites of political organizations or candidates’, ‘forward electronic messages with political content’,

and ‘participate in political activities over the internet’. These online items could be relevant for measuring the conventional political repertoire of young adults in the current study. Although both the ESS and CID measurements are widely used in comparative studies on political participation, these instruments are not specifically directed at young adults, and are too limited in the number of activities to cover both conventional and unconventional (online) political activities salient for young adults.

In conclusion, the *Participatory Behavior Scale* (the psychometric quality) and the *EUYOUPART* instrument (the extensive measurement of unconventional political participation) were the most promising instruments. The former, however, did not meet our conceptualization of political participation, while the latter overly focused on illegal protest activities. To reach the purpose of an instrument covering conventional and unconventional forms of political participation of young adults, each individual instrument was insufficient, but together the activities in the six instruments add up to a wide range of activities (see Table 2 for an overview of all mentioned political activities in italics, including references to existing instruments). The combination of activities offered the basis for constructing the new instrument for measuring young adults’ political participation. The format of the items in the previous instruments varied between two and five response categories, whereas in several instruments the categories were dichotomized afterwards. A common, neutral introduction prior to the battery of items was: ‘*In the past 12 months, have you done any of the following activities?*’ (cf. Persson & Solevid, 2014).

Taking the instruments and associated items together, offline types of conventional and unconventional political participation were especially well covered. Only two offline unconventional activities, 24 and 25 in Table 2, were added that particularly fit young adults’ stage of life. On the other hand, online activities, especially via social media, were underrepresented in the six instruments. Therefore, online, social media political activities (items 32 to 38 in Table 2) were derived from instruments detected in the database search that were previously excluded in the final stage of the screening of the instruments. Finally, to counterbalance the number of online unconventional activities, three activities (underlined in Table 2) were added to the list of online conventional activities.

Table 2
Overview of Political Participation Activities of Young Adults

Conventional Political Participation		Unconventional Political participation
Offline	1. <i>Vote in national elections</i> (Talô & Mannarini, 2015) ^a	15. <i>Boycott products</i> (Zukin et al., 2006)
	2. <i>Vote in local election</i>	16. <i>Boycott products</i> (Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011; Zukin et al., 2006)
	3. <i>Vote in supranational election</i>	17. <i>Sign (e-mail) petitions</i> (Thomassen, 2001 Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011)
	4. <i>Contact politicians or civil servants</i> (Pancer et al., 2007; Thomassen, 2001)	18. <i>Write a letter or an article to a newspaper</i> (Ogriss & Westphal, 2005)
	5. <i>Contact the media</i> (Zukin et al., 2006)	19. <i>Take part in a lawful public demonstrations</i> (Thomassen, 2001)
	6. <i>Run for a public office</i> (Talô & Mannarini, 2015)	20. <i>Take part in strikes</i> (Ogriss & Westphal, 2005)
	7. <i>Donate money to political parties</i> (Talô & Mannarini, 2015)	21. <i>Spray political slogans on walls</i> (Ogris & Westphal, 2005)
	8. <i>Membership of a political party</i> (Talô & Mannarini, 2015)	22. <i>Sabotage or blocking of (rail) roads</i> (Ogris & Westphal, 2005)
	9. <i>Participating in a political party or action group; Worked on a political campaign</i> (Pancer et al., 2007; Wear political badge or t-shirt (Thomassen, 2001)	23. <i>Occupying buildings</i> (Ogris & Westphal, 2005)
	10. <i>Attend a public consultation (or election) meeting dealing with political or social issues</i> (Ogriss & Westphal, 2005)	24. <i>Attend a show or fundraising events with a political cause</i> (Amna & Ekman, 2013; Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012))
	11. <i>Deliberately abstain from voting in national election</i> (Gaiser et al., 2010) ^b	25. <i>Participate in a lecture or discussion event on political/civic topic</i> (Wittebrood, 1995)
	12. <i>Local election</i>	
	13. <i>Supranational election</i>	
	14. <i>Participate in co-determination body in a company, at school or training centre</i> (Gaiser et al., 2010)	

Table 2 (continued)

Conventional Political Participation		Unconventional Political participation
Online	26. <i>Visit websites of political parties / candidates</i> (Howard et al., 2005; Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011)	31. <i>Contributed to a political discussion on the internet</i> (Ogris & Westphal, 2005; Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011)
	27. <i>Forward (or send) electronic messages with political content</i> (Howard et al., 2005)	32. Writing blogs on a political subject (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
	28. <u>Contact a political party</u> ^c	33. Use a share-button to share a link to a news or political website (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
	29. <u>Follow a politician or party via Twitter</u>	34. Posting an article / video about news / politics (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
	30. <u>Sign up for a political e-news bulletin</u>	35. Accept the invitation of a friend / group for a political meeting (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
		36. Like a politician or political party or support a group they have created (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
		37. Post a political message on your “wall” (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)
		38. Create a new group or activity for a social/political event (Quintelier & Theocharis, 2012)

Note.

^a Items in italic are part of the six discussed instruments

^b Items are part of other instruments/measurements from the database search

^c Underlined items are included as additional online conventional political participation

Assessing the Quality of the Instrument

The PAYA inventory was designed through the analysis of former validated and large-scale research instruments. The political activities that were present in the existing instruments (see Table 2) were examined and assessed on their clarity, coverage of the two types of political participation, and applicability for the target group of young adults. The activities were converted into items and then presented to representatives of young adults to check whether the items were understandable, and fitted in with the activities of the target group.⁴ This resulted in 38 items of political participation, of which 19 referred to conventional and 19 to unconventional political activities, to be used in a self-report questionnaire. The analyses of reliability and validity of this self-report questionnaire is reported in the remainder of this chapter.

Materials and Sample

A paper-and-pencil questionnaire was developed containing the 38 political participation items, as well as a number of items for political interest, political efficacy, media use, and social and political trust. These latter scales, next to student background characteristics, were included to validate the political participation scales. A pilot of the full questionnaire among a few students indicated that the questionnaire was too long to be finished within 45 minutes. Therefore, the questionnaire was divided into three parts, and the resulting three versions of questionnaires each contained two out of three original parts (see Table A1 in Appendix A for the content, indicated by the markings, of the two questionnaires that have been used for this study; the third questionnaire was part of another study).

Because we had multiple versions of questionnaires, we were able to measure the political participation with two formats of response categories. The prevalence of political participation activities was asked with two response options (no, yes) or three response options (never, occasionally, often). With this strategy we could verify the variance of the constructs and determine the optimal number of response categories. Completing one of the versions of the questionnaire took approximately 30 minutes.

4 The group of representatives consisted of 30 vocational and bachelor level students, approximately 18 to 21 years old.

Young adults from two large cities (Groningen and Amsterdam) in the Netherlands participated in the current study. The three questionnaires were completed by 278 participants aged 17 to 25, who were following senior secondary vocational education or higher education (universities and universities of applied sciences). Test leaders, who were instructed in advance, were present when the participants were completing the questionnaires. No incentives were given to the participants for completing the questionnaire.

The final sample consisted of 66 men (37.5%) and 111 women (62.5%). The average age of the young adults was 20 ($SD = 2.41$). The vast majority of young adults had completed lower vocational education (43.5%; ISCED 2), higher general secondary education (34.5%; ISCED 3) or pre-university education (20.2%; ISCED 3). Two young adults had no qualifications (1.2%; ISCED 1), and one respondent had only a qualification of the lowest level of senior secondary vocational education (ISCED 2). This certificate was coded as a lower vocational education diploma.

Data Analysis

The new instrument is based on a 38-item questionnaire (see Table 2 and Appendix A-II, where respondents indicated if they had participated (or not) in each of the activities over the previous year. The answers of respondents with three response options (never, occasionally, often) were recoded to dichotomous data (no/yes), because the response option 'often' was rarely chosen. Six items regarding electoral participation were not suited for the current sample of students, since a major part of the young adults were not yet eligible to vote at the time of the national election in the Netherlands in 2012. Furthermore, activities mentioned in five items were not performed by any of the young adults in the current study: 'participation in a consultation or election meeting', 'participation in a co-determination body in a company, at school or training centre', and three items related to illegal protest activities ('spray political slogans on walls', 'sabotage or blocking of (rail) roads', and 'occupying buildings').

Construct validity

The scalability and reliability of the remaining 27 political participation items is addressed with Mokken Scale Analysis (MSA). MSA is a non-parametric scaling method (Swanborn, 1982). Like factor analysis, MSA assesses how items fit together and whether they describe the same underlying construct. Though factor analysis assumes an equal frequency distribution among items (similar

means and standard deviations), MSA is cumulative and takes the differences in the frequency of participation in activities into account (Van Schuur, 2003). For political participation, it is realistic to expect that activities differ according to their popularity (Garcia-Albacete, 2014; Linssen et al., 2014; McFarland & Thomas, 2006), as most political activities are episodic and therefore have low incidences (Keeter, Jenkins, Zukin, & Andolina, 2003).

The ‘popularity’ of an item is better known as the ‘difficulty’ of an item. This assumption of a certain order in difficulty of the items is part of the Guttman scale (Swanborn, 1982). A perfect Guttman scale means that a person who reports performing a difficult activity (working for a political party) is likely to report a positive response to all items (e.g., signing a petition) that are less difficult (van Schuur, 2003). If items have different frequency distributions, regular factor analysis of dichotomous data is not recommended (Sijtsma, 1998), as the interpretation becomes precarious. Regular factor analysis (exploratory or confirmative) does not capture these differences in ‘easy’ or ‘difficult’ dichotomous political activities (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002; van Schuur, 2003).

The Guttman scale is deterministic and assumes that a respondent follows a precise pattern of answers (Swanborn, 1982). MSA is probabilistic, like Item Response Theory (IRT), and assumes that a respondent who scored positive on an item has a certain probability, which is significantly greater than zero, of also scoring positive on an ‘easier’ item. This means that it is more likely that a person who puts themselves forward as a candidate for a political party will also follow a politician online, but strictly speaking, this does not always have to be the case. In MSA there is no assumption that every item has the same item response function, and therefore, unlike IRT, the scaling is non-parametric (van Schuur, 2011).

MSA has three basic assumptions. First, the latent traits of political participation are unidimensional. Second, the monotonicity of the Item Response Function assumes that each person had a certain, unknown score on the latent traits of political participation, and the probability of a positive response to any of the survey items (e.g., ‘working for a political party’) increases with that unknown score on the latent trait of political participation (Schnaudt & Weinhardt, 2018). For any value of political participation, the probability of a positive response decreases with the difficulty of the item. The order of the item difficulties remains invariant over the latent trait (Gillespie et al., 1987). Third, local independence is assumed, implying that all systematic variation in the responses of an individual is due to the position on the latent trait, and not any other individual characteristic (van Schuur, 2003).

The scalability of the item set was analyzed with the MSP5 software package (Molenaar & Sijtsma, 2000). This software is specifically developed to perform Mokken Scale Analysis. MSA provides four distinct sources of information on the scalability of a set of items. First, the degree to which an item correlates with the other items in the scale is expressed by an item parameter (H_i). A rule of thumb indicates that the H_i values of all the individual items must be greater than .30 to demonstrate sufficient consistency between items (van Schuur, 2003). In MSA, this is also referred to as the coefficient c : the minimum value of individual coefficients H_i in the scale (Van der Ark, 2007). Second, the homogeneity coefficient for a pair of items is H_{ij} and should be greater than 0 (Swanborn, 1982). Third, Loevinger's Homogeneity Coefficient (H) is an indicator of the quality of a scale as a whole, wherein $H < .3$ indicates a non-scalable set of items, $.3 \leq H < .4$ indicates a weak scale, $.4 \leq H < .5$ indicates a medium-strong scale and $H \geq .5$ represents a strong scale (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002). Finally, the coefficient rho provides a measure of the scale reliability (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 1987), and can be treated in a comparable way to the Cronbach alpha statistic.

As a first step, the number of types of political participation was explored using MSA, following the guidelines of Sijtsma, Emons, Bouwmeester, Nyklicek, and Roorda (2008). Using three different lower-bound values c for the item selection procedure ($c = .3, .4$, and $.5$, see Table 3), sets of scales of political participation were assessed. For the record, taking the lowest value of c ($c = 0$), scales can have very low H -values, because the H_i 's can also be 0, and are then practically useless (Hemker, Sijtsma, & Molenaar, 1995). In other words, using the lowest value of c could result in one large scale, which then consists of items that may measure very different types of participation. Setting c to the highest possible value ($= 1$) will search for the perfect Guttman scale, and could result in scales that do not contain all items that measure the same type of participation, or result in more scales than there are types of participation (Hemker et al., 1995). For multidimensional item sets, Sijtsma and Molenaar (2002, p. 81) describe the typical sequence of outcomes when systematically increasing the value of c : first, most or all items form one scale; then, as the lower bound increases, two or more scales are formed; and finally, a lot of smaller scales are formed where several items do not fit in the scales.

Convergent validity

Convergent validity is the degree to which two measures of theoretically related constructs are related (Campbell & Twiske, 1959). Convergent validity was analyzed

through correlations with variables that are assumed to be closely related to political participation: both predictors, as well as the background characteristics of gender, age and educational level. Numerous studies suggest a positive association between political interest, trust, media use, civic involvement, gender, age, and education with political participation (e.g., Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Quintelier, 2013; van Stekelenburg, Klandermans, & Akkerman, 2016; Verba et al., 1995). All indicators were measured in the same questionnaire as the political participation items.

Political and societal interest ($n = 131$) was measured with three items. The items, such as ‘politics is interesting’, were measured on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1) not at all interesting to 4) very interesting (Martin & van Deth, 2007). Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .81.

Political trust ($n = 170$) was measured with the following question: ‘how much do you personally trust each of the nine institutions?’ (Cicognani et al., 2012). A few examples of institutions were: the police, the country’s parliament, and the legal system. Answers were given on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1) ‘no trust’ to 4) ‘a lot of trust’. Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .84.

Social trust ($n = 120$) was measured with three questions regarding the belief that people in general are trustworthy (Schyns & Koop, 2010). For example, ‘Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?’ Higher values refer to more trust, ranging from (0) ‘You almost always can’t be too careful in dealing with people’, to (10) ‘People can almost always be trusted’. Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .82.

Media use ($n = 126$) was measured with four items: TV news, newspapers (regular and politics), and Internet sources (Schulz et al., 2010). Answers were given on a 5-point scale, from 1) ‘never’ to 4) ‘daily’. Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .66.

Civic involvement ($n = 173$) was measured via informal associational membership (Howard & Gilbert, 2008). The questionnaire contained four questions about involvement in ten different organizations. It deals with being a member, donating money, participating in activities and volunteering in these organizations. The activities were combined in an index that represents four types of involvement in an organization (Howard & Gilbert, 2008), from ‘inactive’ (no involvement at all) to ‘superactive’ (three or more of the activities).

Gender was coded 0 for men and 1 for women, *age* was measured in years, and *educational level* was based on three Dutch educational levels, 1 = ‘lower vocational education’, 2 = ‘general secondary education’, and 3 = ‘pre-university education’.

Results

Construct Validity

In our MSA we use three lower bound-values ($c = .3$, $.4$, and $.5$). The default option ($c = .3$) points at one scale of political participation with a large set of 20 items (see Table 3). This scale is weak to moderate and does not include relevant political participation items such as ‘taking part in demonstrations’. The second scale is a strong scale consisting of five unconventional political participation items. Taken together, this is an indication that the items largely measure one latent variable, but the items are not all equally strongly connected. We therefore explored whether stronger subscales were to be constructed, as recommended by Sijtsma et al. (2008). Next, the scales of items with a lower bound $c = .4$ were examined, and again two scales were formed. The first scale contains 16 items, and this scale is slightly stronger in terms of total scale value than the previous scale of 20 items, since the four items with the least fit are excluded. The second scale of five items refers to protest participation, which makes it better to interpret than the first scale.

The analysis with lower bound $c = .5$ produces five scales, of which three scales have only 2 items. The scale with 7 items measures online political participation. The 9-item scale mainly measures conventional political participation with the exception of activities like writing a blog or attending a lecture. However, the scales produced in this stage disregard some core unconventional political activities such as demonstrating, striking, boycotting products, and participating in online discussion forums, and is thus unsuitable for our purpose to produce scales that reflect the broad repertoire of conventional and unconventional political activities of young adults (Norris, 2003; van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009; Zukin et al., 2006).

As expected, the analysis shows that with a higher and more demanding c -value ($.5$), more items become unselected and only a few items form three to four medium to strong scales. Within these scales, items were scattered over both conventional and unconventional forms of political participation. In conclusion, the scales that were formed based on the item selection procedure with lower bounds all have their drawbacks. For instance, small lower bounds provided one large scale that contained items measuring different constructs (Hemker et al., 1995), and the highest lower bound provided five smaller scales where a lot of items were excluded (Sijtsma, 1998).

Table 3
Item Selection Procedure I

Items	Scales	Lower bound = .3		Lower bound = .4		Lower bound = .5	
		1	2	1	2	1	2
	No. items	20	5	16	5	9	2
Mean							
Candidate for a political party (c) ^a	.01	.41	-	-	-	-	-
Contacted a political party (c)	.02	.83	.87	.86			
<i>Created a new group or activity for a political event (u)</i>	.02	.53	-	-		.63	
<i>Written a blog on political subject (u)</i>	.02		.58	.71		.62	
Worked in a political party or political action group (c)	.03	.68	.71	.62			
Member of a political party (c)	.03	.69	.71	.74			
<i>Written a letter for a newspaper or magazine (u)</i>	.04		.35	-	-	-	-
<i>Forwarded e-mail with political content (online)^b (c)</i>	.05	.39	-	-		.47	
Contacted a politician or civil servant (c)	.05	.44	.46	.58			
Worn or displayed a badge/T-shirt stating a political message (c)	.05	.40	.40	-	-	-	-
Contacted the media (c)	.06	.41	.44	-	-	-	-
Taken part in a public demonstration (u)	.07	-	-	.43			.54
Taken part in a political forum or discussion group (u)	.07	.43	.49			.62	
Taken part in a strike or protest march (u)	.09		.43	.45			.54
Signed up for a political <i>e-news bulletin</i> (c)	.10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Responded positively to an invitation to a political meeting (u)	.15	.47	.49	.56			
<i>Posted a political message on social media (u)</i>	.15	.54	.54	.58			
<i>Attended a cultural or fundraising event with political content (u)</i>	.16	.35	-	.60			

Table 3 (continued)

Items	Scales	Lower bound = .3		Lower bound = .4		Lower bound = .5	
		1	2	1	2	1	2
No. items	20	5	5	16	5	9	7
Mean							
Followed a politician or party (c)	.19	.58		.47			.62
Attended a meeting or lecture about a civic issue (u)	.21	.44		.44		.58	
Posted an article or video about politics (u)	.22	.47		.48			.59
Used a share-button to share a link to a political website (u)	.23	.40		.53			.51
Supported a societal-political group (like and share) (u)	.24	.42		.42			.53
Deliberately bought products for political or ethical reasons (u)	.33		.71		.66	.81	
Boycotted certain products for political or ethical reasons (u)	.36		.72		.71	.81	
Visited a website of a political party or politician (c)	.42	.66		.56			.60
Signed a petition (u)	.42	.46		.45		.60	
Scale coefficient <i>H</i>		.47	.62	.50	.69	.60	.81
						.50	.62
							.54

Note.
a (c) = conventional participation; (u) = unconventional participation.
b Items in italic are not in the final two political participation scales.

In the next step we conducted a MSA based on the content of the items. Hemker et al. (1995, p. 343–344) describe in their study that acceptable outcomes of MSA in practice include requiring that: (1) ‘at least two-thirds of the items that measure the same trait (political participation) be selected in one scale’; (2) ‘items that measure different traits are always selected in different scales’; and (3) ‘the number of scales equals the number of traits’ (types of participation). Sijtsma (1998) emphasizes that there is often no unique result of the item selection procedure and that other, informal criteria can be used to make a final decision. Based on these considerations, we performed MSA on an a priori distribution of items between two types of political participation, conventional and unconventional.

We examined whether the two types of political participation, conventional and unconventional, could be indicated as two separate scales. For conventional political participation, we identified 11 items, of which nine items ultimately represent a medium to strong scale. The H_i of two online items (‘forwarding a political e-mail’ and ‘sign up for a e-news bulletin’) was too low. For unconventional political participation, we identified 16 items, ten of which represented an average strong scale. The H_i of the other 6 items was too low or these items were negatively correlated with other items, and therefore these items were excluded from the final scale. Although these items seemed to be scalable in the previous analysis based on 27 items (see Table 3 for these items in italics), that is partly due to the different selection of items at the start of the analysis.

Table 4 displays the scales of *conventional* and *unconventional political participation*, and reports the means for the individual items, as well as the H_i -coefficients. The Conventional Political Participation scale coefficient, H -value of .59, points to a strong cumulative scale, with a satisfactory reliability coefficient (ρ) of .78. The H_i -coefficients reflect the fit of the items within the scale, and ranged from .43 to .85. The Unconventional Political Participation scale coefficient H of .42 indicates a medium-strong cumulative scale. The reliability (ρ) of this construct was .81. The H_i -coefficients range from .33 to .48. There are no indications that the three basic assumptions of MSA were violated. Therefore, the two resulting scales were considered satisfactory in terms of statistical properties.⁵

5 For the record, we performed the item selection procedure on the 19 final items (see Appendix A-III), resulting in the same patterns as the analysis on the 26 items. The lower bounds of .3 and .4 provided one large scale that contained items measuring different constructs, and the highest lower bound, .5, provided four smaller scales where critical items were excluded.

Table 4*Overview of the Items of the Scales of Conventional and Unconventional Political Participation*

Items Conventional Participation	Mean: range 0-1	Scale Item H_i	Items Unconventional Participation	Mean: range 0-1	Scale Item H_i
1. Candidate for a political party	0.01	0.44	1. Taken part in a political forum or discussion group	0.07	0.38
2. Contacted a political party	0.02	0.85	2. Taken part in a public demonstration	0.07	0.41
3. Member of a political party	0.03	0.68	3. Taken part in a strike or protest march	0.09	0.35
4. Worked in a political party or political action group	0.03	0.74	4. Responded positively to an invitation to a political meeting by a friend or group	0.15	0.46
5. Worn or displayed a badge/sticker/T-shirt stating a political message	0.05	0.43	5. Attended a meeting or lecture about a civic issue	0.21	0.41
6. Contacted a politician or civil servant on the national, regional or local level	0.05	0.52	6. Posted an article or video about politics	0.22	0.33
7. Contacted the media	0.06	0.55	7. Supported a societal-political group (like and share)	0.24	0.39
8. Followed a politician or party (online)	0.19	0.60	8. Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons	0.33	0.45
9. Visited a website of a political party or politician	0.42	0.64	9. Boycotted certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons	0.36	0.46
			10. Signed a petition	0.42	0.48
Scale coefficient H		0.59			0.42

The items have different levels of ‘difficulty’ or ‘popularity’, which is reflected in the average scores of the items. In general, the MSA shows that conventional political activities are generally more difficult (have lower averages) than unconventional political activities. For example, the activity ‘candidate for a political party’, with a mean of .01, is less popular than the activity ‘following a politician or political party (online)’, with a mean of .19.

Next, the relationship between the two scales of political participation is inspected. Young adults who participate in conventional activities also tend to participate in unconventional political activities; $r(177) = .58$; $p < .001$. Although these two variables are strongly related, MSA supports the conceptual distinction

between the two types of political participation (see Table 4). The two types of political participation could therefore be treated as two separate scales.

Convergent Validity

To determine the convergent validity of both types of participation, correlations between political participation and a group of content-related antecedents (political interest, political and social trust, media use and civic involvement), and a group of background variables (gender, age, and educational level), was examined. Table 5 shows the correlations among the predictors and political participation scales. Political interest, one of the predictors of political participation, was positively correlated with both conventional, $r(131) = .57, p < .001$, and unconventional political participation, $r(131) = .57, p < .001$. Political trust was moderately correlated with conventional participation, $r(175) = .25, p = .001$. Social trust was moderately correlated with unconventional participation, $r(124) = .27, p = .003$, and had a rather weak relationship with conventional participation, $r(124) = .13, p = .156$, although we cannot conclude that there is no relationship. Media use was moderately correlated with both conventional, $r(131) = .38, p < .001$, and unconventional political participation, $r(131) = .34, p < .001$. Civic involvement had a moderate positive association with unconventional political participation, $r(173) = .26, p = .001$. However, civic involvement seems not to be related with conventional political participation, $r(173) = .11, p = .150$.

With regard to student background characteristics, males participated more in unconventional political activities than females, $r(175) = -.19, p = .016$. The older the young adults were, the more they participated in both conventional, $r(175) = .25, p = .001$, and unconventional political activities, $r(175) = .32, p = .001$. Finally, educational level had a positive association with both conventional, $r(168) = .18, p = .020$, and unconventional political activities, $r(168) = .28, p < .001$ (see Table 5).

Table 5
Correlations between Political Participation, Predictors and Background Characteristics

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Conventional political participation	-									
2. Unconventional political participation	.59**	-								
3. Political interest	.57**	.57**	-							
4. Political trust	.25**	.15*	.28**	-						
5. Social trust	.13	.27**	.33**	.31**	-					
6. Media use	.38**	.34**	.55**	.19*	.23*	-				
7. Civic involvement	.11	.26**	.19*	.19*	.25**	.07	-			
8. Gender	-.14	-.19*	-.09	.07	-.02	-.18*	.13	-		
9. Age	.25**	.32**	.21*	.12	.02	.30**	.15*	-.15*	-	
10. Educational level ¹	.18*	.28**	.26**	.27**	.27**	.29*	.37**	.04	.13	-

Note.

¹Spearman rank order correlations.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of this study was to develop an instrument for measuring political participation among young adults that met the psychometric requirements of scalability, reliability, and validity. The literature review in this study revealed that existing instruments on political participation only partly address unconventional political participation of young adults, do not adequately account for online forms of political participation, capture only a few political activities, or are not directed toward young adults between 18 and 25 years old. Based on items from previous questionnaires, to which new items were added, the *Political Activities of Young Adults* (PAYA) inventory was constructed.

First, the scalability and reliability of the instrument was examined. As some political activities are more demanding in terms of effort and allegiance than others, young adults are less likely to be engaged in these than other activities. To reflect these differences in political participation, Mokken Scale Analysis (MSA) was used to construct scales of political participation. A first explorative item selection procedure with MSA on 27 items resulted in multiple fragmented subtypes of political participation which were difficult to interpret. Moreover, in the MSA a few core items of political participation, such as taking part in demonstrations, were excluded. Therefore, MSA was subsequently performed on the two predetermined subtypes of political participation: conventional and unconventional. The analysis of both types of political participation resulted in two medium to strong reliable scales with 9 items for conventional political participation and 10 items for unconventional political participation.

Supporting the convergent validity of the PAYA inventory, strong positive relationships of political interest with both conventional and unconventional political participation were found. Political trust proved to be moderately correlated to conventional participation, and social trust was moderately correlated to unconventional participation. Media use on politics was moderately correlated with both conventional and unconventional political participation. These results reflect positive relationships between political interest, trust, media use, and political participation reported in previous studies (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; de Zuniga, Jung, & Valenzuela, 2012; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Richardson, 2004; van Stekelenburg et al., 2016; Verba et al., 1995). Whereas previous studies found relatively strong correlations between civic involvement and both subtypes of political participation (Talô & Mannarini, 2015; van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009),

the correlation between civic involvement and political participation in our study was rather small. As previous studies were based on adult samples, this could indicate that for young adults political and civic participation reflect distinct domains of activity (cf. Armingeon, 2007; Zani & Barrett, 2012). This strengthens, for this age group, the discriminant validity of the PAYA inventory.

Limitations

The instrument does not distinguish between activities with weekly or annual participation. A second limitation is that voting, still the most performed political activity, could not be included in the current instrument. At the time of data collection, a large part of the sample of young adults had not been entitled to vote in the previous national election, and therefore voting was left out of the instrument. For the same reason, voting behavior is often not included in empirical research into the political participation of young adults (cf. Quintelier, 2008). Some studies indicated that voting has a special character as a distinct form of political participation (Parry et al., 1992; Theocharis & van Deth, 2018a). As a result, voting behavior is often measured with a single item (e.g., Teorell et al., 2007).

Furthermore, young adults in this study were all following some form of education, thereby excluding young people who for one reason or another (e.g., full-time job, unemployment) are no longer in education, which represents just under 20 percent of the population of 15 to 25 year olds (Alejandro Perez & Lautenbach, 2018). Therefore, the external validity in this study on Dutch young adults in general cannot be fully addressed. Further research may cross-validate the two participation scales in a larger and more representative sample of young adults. Another limitation is that activities were measured through self-reports, which might lead to an overrepresentation of reported political activities. However, although reporting of social desirable answers is of particular concern in politically sensitive questionnaires (Berinsky, 2004), this seems not be the case in this study, because we did not ask about politically sensitive subjects. Alternative ways of measuring political activity, such as through observations or through open interviews, also have limitations, especially with regard to quantifying the data.

As far as content validity is concerned, it was a challenge to ensure that all relevant political activities were measured. At the same time, it is a burden for respondents to fill in a long list of activities, especially when most political activities have a low incidence (Keeter et al., 2003). The final battery of 38 items represented the repertoire of political participation at the time of data collection as extensively

as possible. Still, some newly emerged activities were not included, such as ‘guerrilla gardening’⁶ and ‘flash mobs’ (cf. van Deth, 2014), or irregular modes, such as ‘reclaiming the street parties’⁷. The data were collected in 2014 and 2015, while the repertoire of activities of political participation keeps expanding and changing, and the same applies for digital media. Future studies could therefore focus on new ways that young adults participate in the democratic society via digital media, and on how to accurately measure this changing repertoire (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2018). However, the measurement becomes increasingly complex if new activities keep emerging, hence a proposal for standardization of the measurement of political participation is very welcome (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018b).

In general, political participation studies hint at a general shift in the repertoire of political participation of young adults, from conventional to unconventional activities (Dalton, 2008; Stolle et al., 2005; Zukin et al., 2006). The young adults in the sample of this study indeed showed a higher rate of unconventional political participation than conventional political participation (cf. Sloam, 2016; Vromen, 2003). Whether this shift applies in general to the current generation of young adults could be the topic of further research. At the same time, future research can focus on the presence of conceptual types of participation repertoires or identities associated with young adults: ‘everyday makers’ (Bang & Sørensen, 1999; Li & Marsh, 2008) and ‘standby citizens’ (Amnå & Ekman, 2013). The PAYA inventory might be helpful in future studies into these types, and may be supplemented with the measurement of civic knowledge, political interest, trust, news consumption and insights into how young people relate to politics (Sveningsson, 2016). This allows the PAYA inventory to facilitate further research into (predictors of) the political participation of young adults.

6 Growing plants without permission on private or public grounds (abandoned or neglected), with the aim of improving the neighborhood.

7 Holding street parties to prevent cars from being able to access the street.

3

The Relation between Adolescents'
Citizenship Competences and
Their Participation in Society
as Young Adults

Abstract

During the past decades, young adults have become alienated from democratic institutions. Consequently, in many Western countries citizenship education has been introduced to stimulate the development of civic competences. In the current chapter, we assessed the long-term association of fourteen-year-old Dutch students' civic competences with their political and civic participation in young adulthood. The data on civic competences were derived from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2009, a survey among students in the 8th grade. In a follow-up study in 2015 and 2016, political and civic participation were measured by interviewing 134 of these students when they were young adults (around 21 years old). The results showed that students' civic knowledge and support of democratic values were related to their unconventional political participation seven years later. A positive relation between civic knowledge and conventional political participation was also found. Students' participation in extracurricular civic activities during high school was not related to civic participation or either forms of political participation.

Introduction

Many democratic societies suffer from a declining voter turnout among young adults (e.g., O'Toole, Lister, Marsh, Jones, & McDonagh, 2003; Putnam, 2000; Whiteley, 2011). Some scholars argue that young adults have become alienated from democratic institutions and are politically indifferent and apathetic (Bovens & Wille, 2008; Dalton, 2004; Henn, Weinstein & Forrest, 2005). In response to the lack of political participation among youth and the corresponding democratic deficit (O'Toole et al., 2003), many Western countries have encouraged schools to promote active citizenship (Eurydice, 2017). In this study, education for active citizenship entails both spending attention in the curriculum on civic competences (knowledge, values and attitudes) as well as promoting participation in extracurricular activities, like involving students in community activities or in democracy activities at school. The assumption of providing citizenship education at school is that students will acquire more civic competences and will become more active citizens as they reach adulthood.

Civic competences are usually defined as a combination of “the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to enable individuals to become an active citizen” (Hoskins, Villalba, Van Nijlen, & Barber, 2008, p.2). Civic skills are difficult to measure in survey research (Hoskins et al., 2008), which is why these measurements often resemble attitudes. Hence, we focused on civic competences as a combination of civic knowledge, attitudes and values.

Over the past two decades, a number of studies have supported the notion that civic education has a positive effect on students' civic knowledge (e.g., Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy, & Lopes, 2010; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Persson, 2014). Although formal civic education classes tend to affect students' civic knowledge, the effects of classroom-based instruction on students' political attitudes and democratic values are less evident (Finkel & Ernst, 2005; Stadelmann-Steffen & Sulzer, 2017). Political attitudes and democratic values seem to be better promoted by involving students in extracurricular civic activities, such as community service programs and democracy activities (e.g., Dassonneville, Quintelier, Hooghe, & Claes, 2012; Lopes, Benton, & Cleaver, 2009; Metz & Youniss, 2005; Schmidt, Shumow, & Kackar, 2006). That is why we also pay attention to students' participation in extracurricular civic activities in the current study, referring to voluntary activities both inside and outside school.

Whether civic competences will lead to young adults who are more prone to political and civic participation has been the subject of many studies. A major part of these studies is cross-sectional by nature and focused on the relationship between students' civic competences and their intention to participate politically in later life, instead of actual political participation. Cohen and Chaffee (2012), among others, report that students' civic knowledge, next to their self-efficacy, is associated with their intention to vote. The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) from England showed that adolescents (16 year olds) who reported that they had received a lot of citizenship education were more likely to have positive civic competences, such as political attitudes, efficacy, and intentions toward future political and civic participation (Keating et al., 2010). Other studies assessing the impact of citizenship education found positive effects on political attitudes and intentions for future political and civic participation (Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Torney-Purta, 2002). The current study, in contrast, assessed the long-term associations of the civic competences of high school students (aged approximately 14 years old), and active participation in extracurricular civic activities, with actual political and civic participation in young adulthood (aged approximately 21 years old).

A well-established finding in the literature is that the more knowledgeable young adults are, and the more they feel capable of participating, the more likely they are to engage in all sorts of political activities (Bengtsson & Christensen, 2014; Cho & McLeod, 2007; Galston, 2001; Verba, Scholzman & Brady, 1995). Moreover, the support of democratic values—as part of civic competence—is related to the willingness of participation in society (Papanastasiou & Koutselini, 2003). However, the cross-sectional design of the previous studies is not suitable to substantiate the long-term relationship between civic competences and political participation.

Review of Empirical Studies on Civic Competences and Participation in Society

Most former studies on adolescents' political participation and civic competences relied on data of the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) and measured intentions to participate in later life. These studies, however, did not have a longitudinal design, and therefore it is not clear whether intended participation as reported by students has a predictive value for actual participation in young adulthood (Castillo et al., 2015; Hooghe & Wilkenfeld, 2007; Miranda, Castillo & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2017; Persson, 2012). While the intended participation

has been a standard measure for many years, it has recently been shown that the intentions of adolescents to participate and actual participation two to three years later are weakly to moderately related (Quintelier & Blais, 2016), and this relationship appeared to be slightly stronger in late adolescence (18 years old; $r = .26$) than in middle adolescence (16 years old; $r = .20$). This implies that there is no overwhelming evidence that adolescents' intentions to participate in political activities will be fulfilled later in life. Additionally, citizenship norms and political efficacy had a significant relation with both intended and reported participation, but the relation of these two predictors with intended participation was significantly stronger (Quintelier & Blais, 2016), suggesting that the link between political attitudes and actual political participation is less prominent.

A few studies have examined the long-term relations of students' civic competences and active participation in extracurricular civic activities inside and outside school with actual political participation in young adulthood. Most longitudinal studies use a broad measure of participation, combining both political and civic activities (Finlay & Flanagan, 2013; McFarland & Thomas, 2006). This is problematic because research shows that the influence of civic competences and active participation in extracurricular civic activities is different for future political participation than for future civic participation (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007; Manning & Edwards, 2014). As a result, it is not clear which of these competences or participation in extracurricular activities contributed to political or civic participation or both.

In many studies, political participation and civic participation are not clearly distinguished (Adler & Goggin, 2005; Ekman & Amnå, 2012; Jenkins, Andolina, Keeter, & Zukin, 2003), as the measurement of civic participation often consists of mainly political activities. While political participation refers to all the "voluntary activities by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state" (van Deth, 2014, p. 354), or "activities that are targeted towards the area of politics" (p. 357), civic participation refers to 'the participation of a citizen in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community's future' (Adler & Goggin, 2005, p. 241). Civic participation comprises activities such as volunteering, helping others or donating money to charity, and are not targeted at politics.

The first essential longitudinal link found in empirical studies is between students' civic knowledge—as part of civic competence—and political participation as young adults. A German study indicates that students' civic knowledge predicts

voting, seven years later (Krampen, 2000). Also, in the United States, a link was found between civic knowledge and voting, eight years after high school (Hart et al., 2007). Apart from aforementioned studies, most studies on the impact of students' civic competences on political participation in young adulthood (18 to 25 years) did not include voting (only other activities in election campaigns), as not all respondents had reached the voting age at the time of the last elections.

The second essential link is between students' political efficacy—as part of civic competence—and political participation (Verba et al., 1995). Longitudinal studies indicate that the more adolescents are confident in being able to participate in politics, the more likely they engage in political activities at a later age (Eckstein, Noack, & Gniewosz, 2013; Pasek, Feldman, Romer & Jamieson, 2008; Quintelier & van Deth, 2014; Vecchione & Caprara, 2009).

In the empirical literature, the longitudinal link between civic competences and civic participation is understudied. Former research suggests that the effect of civic competences on civic participation is relatively small (Hart et al., 2007).

As regards the impact of participation in extracurricular civic activities, a few longitudinal studies found positive relations with later political participation (Dassoneville et al., 2012; Glanville, 1999; Keating & Janmaat, 2015) and civic participation as well (Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Smith, 1999; Zaff et al., 2003). For example, Keating and Janmaat (2015) showed that participation in voluntary school activities in the 11th grade (mock elections, student councils) predicted actual political participation of young adults, four years later. In a similar vein, Glanville (1999) established a relation between participation in voluntary school activities and participation in political activities (e.g., attending a political rally, working on a political campaign) six years later. Fredricks and Eccles (2006) found a small effect among former high school students of participation in school clubs (e.g., student government) on civic participation (being a member of an organizing committee in a charity organization, donating money to charity). Zaff et al. (2003) showed in a four-wave panel study among U.S. students (8th–12th grade), the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS), that students who consistently participated in extracurricular activities were 50 percent more likely to volunteer (civic participation) and vote (political participation) in young adulthood.

The studies on political participation discussed so far were all based on conventional political participation only. More and more studies indicate that young adults are interested in politics, but that they are turned off by the existing, traditional political activities (Cammaerts, Bruter, Banaji, Harrison, & Anstead,

2013; Harris, Wyn, & Younes, 2010; Henn & Foard, 2013). To further discuss empirical longitudinal studies on political participation, a distinction needs to be made between conventional and unconventional political participation. Conventional political activities, such as working on a political campaign, voting, or contacting politicians, aims to influence politics through the electoral process, whereas unconventional political activities tries to influence politics from the outside (van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009). Unconventional political participation, split into violent and non-violent forms, became known as a concept through the work of Barnes and Kaase (1979). Considering only the non-violent political participation as democratically accepted, most researchers operationalize unconventional participation as peaceful protest activities, which is a combination of signing petitions, joining boycotts, and attending lawful demonstrations (Stockemer & Carbonetti, 2010). Unconventional political activities are picked up by young people and do not seem to fall under the declining trend of conventional political activities (e.g., Dalton, 2008a; Li & Marsh, 2008; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). Unconventional political activities are in general considered less intensive and less demanding than conventional political activities (excluding voting and donating money to a political party) because there is usually less commitment needed and they are accessible to anyone (Marien, Hooghe, & Quintelier, 2010).

Dalton (2008a) stated that young people in the United States are much more involved in unconventional political activities compared to electoral activities. He attributed this to the extent to which attitudes toward good citizenship are changing. Dalton (2008b) defined these attitudes as “a shared set of expectations about the citizen’s role in politics” (p. 78), and these attitudes influence the political behavior of young adults (Quintelier & van Deth, 2014). Following Dalton, two types of attitudes toward citizenship—as part of civic competences— can be distinguished: duty-based and engaged citizenship. Duty-based citizenship attitudes presuppose individuals to participate as a civic duty, which may stimulate voting and other conventional political activities (Dalton, 2008b; Quintelier & Blais, 2016). In contrast, engaged citizenship attitudes presuppose individuals to act on their principles, be politically independent, address social needs, and encourages the individuals toward unconventional participation (Dalton 2008b). Not only in the United States, but also in Western Europe these two types of attitudes toward citizenship have been investigated, and largely confirm the work of Dalton: duty-based citizenship is declining, and though there is a rise of engaged citizenship

among adolescents, this is not observed in all Western European countries (Hooghe & Oser, 2015).

Scholars empirically substantiated the link between engaged citizenship attitudes and unconventional political participation (Bolzendahl & Coffé, 2013). In a three-wave panel study among 16 to 21 year olds, Quintelier and van Deth (2014) showed that attitudes toward duty-based citizenship were related to conventional political participation and attitudes toward engaged citizenship predicted unconventional political participation. Likewise, students' engaged citizenship attitudes had an impact on civic participation in young adulthood (Hart et al., 2007).

Other predictors of unconventional political participation, next to citizenship attitudes, were found in three longitudinal studies in three different countries (Dassonneville et al., 2012; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Keating & Janmaat, 2015). These predictors were all related to the broader concept of students' active participation in extracurricular civic activities. Based on a two-year panel study, Flemish researchers concluded that only membership of the school council fostered unconventional political participation (Dassonneville et al., 2012). For involvement outside school, a 5-year panel study in Belgium described a small to moderate effect of (the number of) membership(s) of new social movement associations on unconventional political participation (Quintelier, 2013). Fredricks and Eccles (2006) point to a small effect of volunteer service activity among high school students on unconventional political participation. However, a longitudinal panel study among a representative sample aged 16 or older in the Netherlands found no effect of involvement in voluntary associations on unconventional political participation 18 months later (van Ingen & van der Meer, 2016).

Summarizing the discussion of longitudinal findings, we discover that there are still gaps in the empirical literature on the predictive value of high school students' civic competences and participation in extracurricular civic activities on their future actual political (conventional and unconventional) and civic participation. While civic knowledge, support for democratic values and political efficacy was found to be associated with intended future political behavior, it is not yet known if these civic competences lead to actual participation in society as a young adult. Moreover, the relationship between civic knowledge, support for democratic values, political efficacy and civic participation has, to our knowledge, not yet been fully studied. Most studies on civic participation only focus on the link with participation in extracurricular civic activities inside and outside school. Students' participation in extracurricular civic activities are related both

to political and civic participation in young adulthood. Furthermore, duty-based and engaged citizenship attitudes seem to be important for different measures of political participation. The aforementioned predictors of participation have not previously been combined in a longitudinal study, which is why this study attempts to identify both the influence of civic competences and participation in extracurricular civic activities on conventional and unconventional political and civic participation.

The Current Study and Hypotheses

The central aims of this chapter are to study the long-term relation between 14-year-old students' civic competences and participation in extracurricular civic activities on their conventional and unconventional political and civic participation in young adulthood (at approximately 21 years old), and to estimate which civic competences and extracurricular civic activities are important for which forms of participation. The civic competences we distinguished are civic knowledge, support for democratic values, duty-based and engaged citizenship attitudes, and political efficacy. Participation in extracurricular civic activities is delineated within and outside the school. Concerning our dependent variables related to future participation, we made a distinction between political and civic participation and further refined political participation into conventional and unconventional participation. Overall, this study tries to combine a long-term approach with a refined measurement of political and civic participation.

Based on the earlier findings presented above, we expected a positive relation of high school students' participation in extracurricular activities (inside and outside school) with both conventional and unconventional political participation, as well as with civic participation, controlled for background characteristics (Hypothesis 1).

Next, we expected differential effects for civic knowledge, support for democratic values, political efficacy and duty-based and engaged citizenship attitudes on the three outcomes. First, we expected positive relationships between students' civic knowledge, support for democratic values and political efficacy with conventional and unconventional political participation as a young adult, controlled for background characteristics, while we expected no relation of these variables with civic participation (Hypothesis 2). And, secondly, we hypothesized that engaged citizenship attitudes would have a stronger relationship with unconventional political participation and civic participation, whereas duty-based citizenship attitudes would be more strongly related with conventional political participation (Hypothesis 3).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected in a two-wave study among Dutch adolescents and young adults. The data of the first wave are derived from the Dutch sample in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2009 (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). In 2009, Grade 8 students, who were approximately 14 years old at that time, completed a test and a questionnaire. The sampling method was a two-stage stratified cluster design (Schulz et al., 2010). Approximately 150 secondary schools in each participating country were sampled using a probability proportional to school size. Second, from each selected school one or two intact classes were sampled. In total 2,491 students in 85 schools in the Netherlands participated in the study.

The second wave of interviews among young adults took place in 2015 and 2016. 1,493 young adults were selected from the original sample who participated in the 2009 ICCS study, and whose parental addresses were reachable by public transport within a time frame of 90 minutes (see Figure 1 for an overview). To get in contact with these young adults, various methods were used. First, 585 respondents were contacted through their Facebook pages. Second, a snowball method was used to get in touch with 46 former classmates of the respondents, regardless of whether they had a Facebook account or not. Third, 90 old addresses of students were retrieved via their former secondary school. Unfortunately, most schools did not have this old administrative data available. Fourth, 271 new addresses were requested from the municipal administration. Based on these four strategies, 992 young adults were contacted. It proved difficult to trace these participants, and their willingness to participate in the second wave was low. It is not clear how many participants actually received the message, but in any case 764 participants did not respond to our call. Consequently, we received 228 reactions, of which 178 positively and 50 negatively responded to participate in our study. Of the 178 people who were willing to participate, eventually 134 people actually participated in an interview. The others did not react to follow-up contacts to make an appointment, or cancelled the appointment made.

Figure 1. Response tree of follow-up study (wave 2).

The current study includes 134 respondents of whom data from two waves were available. The students came from 32 different secondary schools. For the purpose of the data analysis, the ICCS surveys responses of the first wave were connected to the interview responses of the second wave using a unique coding key of the ICCS study. Comparing the 134 participants with the remainder of the ICCS sample of 2,357 respondents in terms of their background data and ICCS data on civic competences, analysis showed that there were almost no differences in the distribution of gender ($\phi = -0.024$, $p = 0.225$) and religious background ($\phi = -0.037$, $p = 0.067$). However, participants in the study had on average a higher socioeconomic status (parental occupation $d = .49$ and parental education $d = .39$)

and higher scores for political attitudes and participation in the community in Grade 8 (democratic values $d = 0.16$, political trust $d = .20$ and participation in the community $d = 0.21$). This is mainly caused by an underrepresentation of students from the pre-vocational track (21 participants) compared to students from the academic tracks ('senior general secondary education' and 'pre-university education', equaling 113 participants) in the second wave. For the academic tracks, no substantial deviations were found between the 2015/2016 sample and the 2009 sample (1,423 students in academic tracks) for gender, religious background, as well as political attitudes and students' participation in the community. Only for socio-economic status (parental occupation $d = 0.40$ and parental education $d = 0.30$) did the two waves differ for students in academic tracks.

Variables and Instruments

Dependent variables

The three dependent variables, namely conventional political participation, unconventional political participation, and civic participation, were measured during the second wave. During the interviews, the respondents were asked whether or not they had participated in 33 different political activities in the last 12 months. For each political activity respondents indicated either 'No, I did not participate over the past 12 months' (coded as 0) or 'Yes, I participated over the past 12 months' (coded as 1). Using Mokken Scale Analysis (MSA, Molenaar & Sijtsma, 2000) and based on the results of the previous chapter, we created two scales of political participation: conventional and unconventional participation (see Table 1).

Conventional Political Participation. The final scale consisted of ten items. Item examples are: 'Member of a political party'; 'Attended a political meeting organized by the (local or national) government'; and 'Contacted a politician or civil servant at the national, regional or local level'. Each individual item in the scale has an item scalability coefficient (H_i) of at least .30 (Sijtsma, Debets, & Molenaar, 1990). The quality of the scales as a whole was assessed by Loevingers Homogeneity Coefficient (H) (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002). The general scale coefficient H , with a value of .45 for conventional political participation, points to a medium-strong cumulative scale. Table 1 reports the means for the individual items, as well as the H_i -coefficients (ranging from .38 to .56). This scale deviates from the original scale from Chapter 2 on two points: one item 'candidate for a political party' was not included (since none of the respondents did this), and this was replaced by

two other items ('attended a political meeting organized by the local or national government' and 'signed up for a political e-news bulletin').

Unconventional political participation. The final scale consisted of ten items. Item examples are: 'Taken part in a strike or protest march'; 'Posted an article or video about politics'; and 'Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons'. The general scale coefficient $H = 0.46$ for unconventional political participation indicates a medium-strong cumulative scale, similar to the original scale in Chapter 2. The H_i -coefficients for the individual items range from .31 to .57.

Table 1

Overview of the Items of the Scales of Conventional and Unconventional Political Participation

Items Conventional Participation	Mean: range 0-1	Scale Item H_i	Items Unconventional Participation	Mean: range 0-1	Scale Item H_i
1. Contacted a political party	0.03	0.51	1. Taken part in a political forum or discussion group	0.05	0.41
2. Member of a political party	0.05	0.54	2. Taken part in a public demonstration	0.05	0.43
3. Worked in a political party or political action group	0.06	0.47	3. Taken part in a strike or protest march	0.08	0.43
4. Contacted the media	0.07	0.38	4. Posted an article or video about politics	0.20	0.56
5. Worn or displayed a badge/sticker/T-shirt stating a political message	0.08	0.46	5. Supported a societal-political group (like and share)	0.26	0.51
6. Attended a political meeting organized by the (local or national) government	0.09	0.39	6. Responded positively to an invitation to a political meeting by a friend or group	0.26	0.45
7. Contacted a politician or civil servant on the national, regional or local level	0.11	0.43	7. Attended a meeting or lecture about a civic issue	0.29	0.31
8. Signed up for a political e-news bulletin	0.17	0.39	8. Boycotted certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons	0.52	0.53
9. Followed a politician or party (online)	0.24	0.46	9. Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons	0.52	0.52
10. Visited a website of a political party or politician	0.53	0.56	10. Signed a petition	0.60	0.57
Scale coefficient H		0.45			0.46

Note. Analysis based on 134 respondents.

Civic participation. The measurement of civic participation is a combination of four activities (see Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002b; Zukin et al., 2006). The four civic activities (in the previous twelve months) are: ‘Activities to raise money for charitable causes’ (1 = yes, 0 = no); ‘Doing volunteer work on a regular basis’ (1 = at least once per week, 0 = less than once per week); ‘Active participation in a group or organization’ (1 = participated or did voluntary work in any of eight different voluntary organizations, 0 = no affiliation, not being a member of or donating money to any of eight different voluntary organizations); and ‘Giving (informal) help to family members, neighbors or acquaintances’ (1 = at least once per week, 0 = less than once per week). The answers have been combined into an index of civic participation. The scaling of these items failed due to the lack of a popularity ranking of activities (Mokken scaling).

Independent variables

All independent variables were measured in the ICCS 2009 study. The main study is described in the International Report and accompanying Technical Report (Schulz et al, 2010; Schulz et al., 2011).

Civic knowledge. The ICCS study measured civic knowledge using a 79-item cognitive test (Schulz et al, 2010). The test is divided into two parts: 25 percent covered knowledge of citizenship, and 75 percent reasoning and analyzing civic and citizenship information. The final scale is derived using a Rasch model in the OPLM program (Verhelst, Glas, & Verstralen, 1993), and has a mean of 150 and a standard deviation of 10 (Schulz et al., 2011).

Political attitudes: support for basic democratic values. Students’ answers regarding support for the basic democratic values of five items ranged on a 4-point scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Item scores were recoded such that higher scores correspond to more support. Two examples are: ‘Everyone should always have the right to express their opinions freely’; and ‘All citizens should have the right to elect their leaders freely’ (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.171-174). The final scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of .70.

Political attitudes: engaged citizenship. Student perceptions of the importance of engaged citizenship were measured on a 4-point scale from *very important* to *not at all important*. The students rated the following four statements: ‘Participating in peaceful protests against laws believed to be unjust’; ‘Participating in activities to benefit people in the local community’; and taking part in activities (1) ‘Promoting

human rights', and (2) 'Protecting the environment' (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 176). The scale has a Cronbach's alpha of .68.

Political attitudes: duty-based citizenship. Students rated their perceptions of the importance of duty-based citizenship on a 4-point scale from *very important* to *not at all important*. Examples of the topics of the six statements are: 'Voting in every national election'; 'Learning about the country's history'; and 'Engaging in political discussions' (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 176). Cronbach's alpha of the scale is .63.

Political efficacy. Students rated six items about internal political efficacy on a 4-point scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Examples of items are: 'I know more about politics than most people my age'; 'I am able to understand most political issues easily'; and 'As an adult I will be able to take part in politics' (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 177-180). Cronbach's alpha of the scale is .87.

Participation in extracurricular activities at school. Students reported whether they had done six activities at school, such as 'Voluntary participation in music or drama activities outside of regular lessons'; 'Active participation in a debate'; or 'Voting for class representative or school parliament'. Answer categories ranged from *within the last 12 months* and *more than a year ago* to *never* (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 167-168). The response *never* was coded as (0) and the other two categories were recoded as *yes* (1). Cronbach's alpha of the scale is .61.

Participation in extracurricular activities outside school. Students were asked to indicate if they had participated in six organizations or activities, for example: 'Environmental organization'; 'Human rights organization'; and 'An organization collecting money for a social cause'. Answer categories were: *Within the last 12 months*, *more than a year ago*, or *never* (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.167-168.). The response 'never' was recoded as *no* (0) and the other two categories as *yes* (1). The answers have been combined into an index of extracurricular activities outside school (community participation), since little correlation between the items is to be expected (activities in one organization do not necessarily coincide with activities in another organization).

Control variables

Gender was coded as follows: 0 for boys and 1 for girls. *Socioeconomic status* (SES) is a combination of three traditional indices (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.193): 1) The highest occupational status of one of the parents (HISEI), measured via the International Socio-Economic Index of occupational status; 2)

the number of books at home, ranging from (0) 0-10 books to (5) more than 500; and 3) the highest educational level of one of the parents (HISCED), measured in the number of educational years. The resulting composite scores are converted to z-scores for the data analysis.

For *Religious affiliation*, a question was asked whether the respondents identified themselves with a religion. Categories of religious affiliation were dichotomized as: (0) not identifying with any religion, and (1) identifying with a religion (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2010, p. 107).

Data Analysis

First descriptive statistics and bivariate associations between variables are presented. Then, MPlus version 7.31 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) is used for a multiple multivariate regression analysis (using a Maximum Likelihood estimator) to assess the predictive value of the civic competences and active participation on political participation and civic participation. Beforehand, we checked for multilevel structure of the data (students nested in classes). There was zero intra-class correlation in the dependent variables, so single level models were considered appropriate. For all models, the unstandardized coefficients are reported. The full information maximum likelihood procedure in MPlus was used to handle the missing data (concerning only a few cases). In the results, various model fit indices, such as RMSEA, CFI, and SRMR, will be presented. For these indices, the following recommended cutoff values were considered: $\leq .06$ for RMSEA, $\geq .95$ for CFI and $\leq .08$ for SRMR to assess sufficient/good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The multivariate analysis consisted of three steps. In the first model (Model 1), the associations between students' civic competences and students' active participation on the three dependent variables were tested.⁸ The three dependent variables were allowed to correlate. Correlations among dependent variables are included in the tables. The coefficients of the predictor variables were freely estimated for each of the dependent variables. In the model, most of the covariances between the independent variables were constrained to zero, except for covariances as indicated in the overview of empirical literature. Based on this overview, the following covariances were also freely estimated: Political efficacy & Participation at school; Political efficacy & Participation in the community;

8 Using a significance level of .05 (one-tailed).

Participation at school & Participation in the community; Political efficacy & Civic knowledge; and Duty-based & Engaged citizenship behavior.

In the subsequent model (Model 2), the three control variables were added. Additional covariances between predictor variables that were freely estimated (based on the overview of empirical literature) were: SES and Civic knowledge; and SES and Political efficacy. Again, the coefficients of the predictor variables were estimated freely for each of the three dependent variables.

In the last model (Model 3), a parsimonious model was estimated. Several steps were taken to create this parsimonious model. First, the predictors that had non-significant results for all three dependent variables were removed from the model. Then, in order to test our hypothesis that civic knowledge is positively related to conventional and unconventional political participation, and not related to civic participation, we conducted a Wald test and contrasted the coefficients of civic knowledge across the different outcome variables. The same approach is used for our hypothesis regarding the differential effects of duty-based and engaged citizenship behavior on conventional and unconventional political participation. The coefficients that did not differ across the dependent variables, according to the Wald test, were fixed to be equal.

Results

Descriptives

The dependent variable *Conventional political participation* has a mean value of 1.61 and a standard deviation of 1.88 (see Table 2). This means that young adults participate in only a few conventional political activities, but they vary in the number of activities. The dependent variable *Unconventional political participation* has a mean value of 2.87 and a standard deviation of 2.26. In general, young adults in the current sample participated slightly more in unconventional political activities than in conventional activities; $t(133) = -7.36, p < 0.001$. On average, young adults participate in at least one (mean of 1.11, standard deviation of 1.11) of the four civic activities. Thirty-seven percent of the young adults did not participate in any civic activity. The means of several attitudes and values are above the scale midpoints, indicating that most respondents adhere to basic democratic values and attitudes.

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics of all the Variables in the Analyses*

Variable	N				
Gender	134	Male: 51.5%		Female: 48.5%	
Religious affiliation	133	No: 55.6%		Yes: 44.4%	
Educational track	134	Lower vocational: 15.7%	General secondary: 28.4%	Pre-university: 56.0%	
Dependent variables		Mean	Standard deviation	Lowest score	Highest score
Conventional pol. participation	134	1.61	1.88	0	9
Unconventional pol. part.	134	2.87	2.26	0	9
Civic participation	134	1.11	1.11	0	4
Independent variables					
Socioeconomic status	134	0.00	1.00	-3.07	1.85
Engaged citizenship	130	2.77	0.51	1	4
Duty-based citizenship	131	2.70	0.41	1	4
Democratic values	130	3.34	0.43	1	4
School participation	134	2.01	1.55	0	6
Community participation	132	1.73	1.33	0	6
Political efficacy	130	2.32	0.62	1	4
Civic knowledge	133	157.50	9.63	131.4	184.9

Testing of Hypotheses

Table 3 shows the correlations among the variables. Concerning the correlations among the independent variables, adolescents who are politically efficacious had higher scores on civic knowledge, $r(129) = .36, p < .001$, on the perception of duty-based citizenship behavior, $r(129) = .42, p < .001$ and had a higher socioeconomic status, $r(127) = .31, p < .001$. The two attitudes toward citizenship behavior, duty-based and engaged citizenship, were reasonably associated, $r(129) = .38, p < .001$. Aside from that, adolescents who participate in at school scored higher on participation in the community, $r(132) = .36, p < .001$ and political efficacy, $r(130) = .33, p < .001$. Multicollinearity was not considered a threat in this case, as the correlations between independent variables were all well below .50.

Table 3
Correlations of all the Variables used in the Analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Conventional political participation	-												
2 Unconventional political participation	.56**	-											
3 Civic participation	.22*	.33**	-										
4 Democratic values	-.01	.18*	-.04	-									
5 Engaged citizenship	.16	.14	.02	.19*	-								
6 Duty-based citizenship	.13	-.01	.09	.08	.38**	-							
7 Participation at school	.05	.09	.03	.02	.17	.13	-						
8 Participation in community	.10	.16	-.01	.11	.13	.07	.36**	-					
9 Political efficacy	.24**	.06	-.07	.18*	.28**	.42**	.33**	.10	-				
10 Civic knowledge	.24**	.28**	.03	.12	.11	.01	.16	-.12	.36**	-			
11 Gender	-.17*	.15	.24*	-.10	-.09	-.08	.06	.18*	-.34**	-.04	-		
12 SES	.16	.23*	-.04	.14	.06	.00	.25**	.05	.31**	.37**	-.10	-	
13 Religious affiliation	.17*	.04	.21*	-.14	.10	.11	.17	.03	.05	-.11	.06	-.19*	-

Note. *N* varies between 127 and 134.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

The correlations among the dependent variables revealed positive relationships. Conventional political participation had a positive relation with unconventional political participation, $r(134) = .56, p < .001$ and civic participation, $r(134) = .22, p = .01$. Unconventional political participation had a moderate association with civic participation, $r(134) = .33, p < .001$.

To determine the unique contribution of the civic competences on the three participation indicators, we decided to test the civic competences without the control variables (Model 1, see Table 4). The test for Model 1, $\Delta\chi^2(21) = 39.413, p = 0.009$ pointed to a better fit of model 1 compared to the empty model. Corresponding model fit indices were: $\chi^2(14) = 23.578, p = 0.052$, CFI = .877, RMSEA = .071, SRMR = .064, suggesting a moderate fit for Model 1. The model explained 12 percent of the variance in both conventional and unconventional political participation and 4 percent in civic participation. Concerning the individual contribution of the civic competences, only civic knowledge is a statistically significant predictor ($b = .07, p = .001$; $Beta = .29$) for unconventional participation as well as for conventional political participation ($b = .02, p = .018$; $Beta = .22$). Thus the more civic knowledge students had, the more they participate in political activities as young adults.

In the next step (Model 2, see Table 4), the control variables were included as predictors in addition to the civic competences. For Model 2, the statistic of $\Delta\chi^2(9) = 31.905, p < 0.001$ indicates that this model fits significantly better than Model 1. The model fit indices for the estimated model again indicate a moderate fit: $\chi^2(36) = 62.329, p = 0.004$, CFI = .742, RMSEA = .074, SRMR = .089. The model explained 18 and 17 percent of the variance in conventional and unconventional political participation, respectively, and 12 percent of the variance in civic participation.

Civic knowledge is a statistical significant predictor for conventional ($b = .02, p = .016$; $Beta = .22$) and unconventional political participation ($b = .06, p = .011$; $Beta = .23$). Regarding the control variables, religious affiliation is associated with both conventional political participation ($b = .33, p = .011$; $Beta = .21$) and civic participation ($b = .46, p = .019$; $Beta = .20$). Students with a religious background participate more in civic and conventional political activities as young adults than non-religious students. Gender contributes significantly to the model of civic participation ($b = .48, p = .016$; $Beta = .22$). This means that young women participate more in civic activities than young men.

Table 4
Multivariate Regression Analysis of Political Participation and Civic Participation on Citizenship Competences

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Civic participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic
Constant	-2.23	-10.40	-.96	-2.14	-9.18	-1.30	-2.16	-9.64	.71
Gender				-.24† (.14)	.70† (.40)	.51* (.21)	-.28* (.12)	.80* (.37)	.51** (.18)
SES				.06 (.07)	.37† (.20)	-.02 (.11)			
Religion				.33* (.13)	.46 (.38)	.46* (.19)	.28** (.11)		.38* (.18)
Dem. values	-.12 (.16)	.49 (.46)	-.09 (.24)	-.14 (.15)	.78† (.43)	-.10 (.22)		.90* (.35)	
Engaged citizenship	.19 (.15)	.55 (.42)	-.09 (.22)	.19 (.14)	.47 (.40)	.03 (.20)			
Duty-based citizenship	.03 (.19)	-.23 (.55)	.51† (.29)	-.01 (.18)	-.15 (.53)	.36 (.27)			
School participation	-.02 (.05)	.17 (.14)	.03 (.07)	-.01 (.05)	.09 (.13)	-.00 (.07)			
Community participation	.07 (.06)	.19 (.16)	.03 (.08)	.07 (.05)	.08 (.15)	-.01 (.08)			
Political efficacy	.19 (.14)	-.41 (.39)	-.36† (.21)	.08 (.14)	-.27 (.40)	-.11 (.21)			
Civic knowledge	.02* (.01)	.07** (.02)	.01 (.01)	.02* (.01)	.05* (.02)	.01 (.01)	.02** (.01)	.06** (.02)	
Partial correlation									
Conv. participation	1			1			1		
Unconv. participation	.53	1		.56	1		.57	1	
Civic participation	.25	.35	1	.26	.32	1	.25	.31	1
Model fit									
R ²	.12	.12	.04	.18	.17	.12	.13	.12	.8
χ ² (df)		23.578† (14)			62.329** (36)			9.06 (10)	

Note. B (S.E.) are displayed.
***p* < .01, * *p* < .05 and † *p* < .1.

As part of our second model, we conducted tests regarding our hypothesis of the individual predictors across the three forms of participation. For hypothesis 2 we conducted a test with ‘civic knowledge’, as we argued that the link with civic knowledge would differ between political and civic participation. The Wald test statistic of 4.607 (1), $p = 0.032$ suggests that civic knowledge has a statistical significant association with unconventional political participation and no association with civic participation. Civic knowledge also has a positive association ($Wald = 3.983$ (1), $p = 0.046$) with unconventional political participation in comparison with conventional political participation. There is no difference regarding civic knowledge between conventional political participation and civic participation ($Wald = .476$ (1), $p = 0.49$). The coefficients of ‘support for democratic values’ and ‘political efficacy’ were non-significant across the model, thus there are no differential effects regarding these two predictors.

We reasoned in hypothesis 3 that the link between duty-based or engaged citizenship would differ between conventional and unconventional political participation, and civic participation. As none of the individual contributions of either citizenship attitude was statistically significant in the model, we were also unable to perform the differential test for hypothesis 3.

Based on the Wald tests and differential effects of civic knowledge across the three outcome variables, a more parsimonious model (Model 3, see Table 4) was tested. The predictors with a non-significant coefficient from the previous models were removed from the model.⁹ The associated fit indices for the parsimonious model are: $\chi^2(10) = 9.06$, $p = 0.53$, CFI = 1.000, RMSEA = .000, SRMR = .045, indicating a good model fit. The final model explained 13 and 12 percent of the variance in conventional and unconventional political participation, respectively, and 8 percent of the variance in civic participation. In the case of conventional political participation, the variables gender ($b = -.28$, $p = .024$; $Beta = -.18$), religious affiliation ($b = .28$, $p = .009$; $Beta = .18$), and civic knowledge ($b = .02$, $p = .001$; $Beta = .25$) are still included. For unconventional political participation, there are three predictors in the model: gender ($b = .80$, $p = .029$; $Beta = .18$), civic knowledge ($b = .06$, $p = .001$; $Beta = .24$), and support for democratic values ($b = .90$, $p = .010$; $Beta = .17$). This last result means that students who endorsed democratic values report more unconventional political participation as young adults. For civic participation, there are two

9 Using a significance level of .10 (one-tailed for predictors; two-tailed for background variables)

indicators in the final model: gender ($b = .51, p = .005; \text{Beta} = .23$), and religious affiliation ($b = .38, p = .034; \text{Beta} = .17$). In general, the (un)standardized coefficients in the parsimonious model did not differ from the coefficients in Models 1 and 2.

Conclusion and Discussion

The current study aimed to determine to what degree students' citizenship competences and participation in extracurricular civic activities are related to their political and civic participation as young adults. Using multivariate regression analysis of longitudinal data from the Dutch ICCS 2009 (14-year-old students) and a follow-up of the Dutch sample in 2015 and 2016 (21 year olds), a positive relation between civic knowledge and conventional and unconventional political participation was found. This finding is in line with previous studies on civic knowledge and political participation (Galston, 2001). As hypothesized, no relation between civic knowledge and civic participation was found in this study.

Persson (2015) points out that education increases knowledge, affects political interest and efficacy, and in the end triggers political participation. This may point to an alternative explanation that we may have found an effect of education in a more general sense instead of civic knowledge. Educational attainment is perceived as one of the strongest indicators of political participation (Verba et al., 1995). However, some researchers suggest that the role of educational attainment is blurred, because it could be either a direct cause for participation, or it serves as a proxy for other factors, such as family socioeconomic status, personality type or cognitive ability (Kam & Palmer, 2008; Persson, 2015). Persson (2015) warns that researchers add education by default in their models as a control variable, but do not exactly know what the relationship means with political participation. With this in mind, the choice was made to only include civic knowledge in the model, especially because civic knowledge can be assumed to be an indication of general cognitive level and therefore shows strong correlation with educational attainment.

Surprisingly and contrary to our first and second hypotheses, political efficacy, support for democratic values and extracurricular participation inside and outside school were not positively related with political and civic participation seven years later. The lack of evidence regarding the influence of these civic competences might be due to the non-prevalence of political attitudes at the age of fourteen. Some political attitudes and orientations can persist from early adolescence through adulthood, such as party identification (Sears & Levy, 2003;

Ventura, 2001), but other political attitudes and orientations of young people, such as political interest and trust, tend to become more stable toward young adulthood, especially in middle and late adolescence (15 to 18, ‘the impressionable years’) when young people are most susceptible to political influences (Eckstein, Noack & Gniewosz, 2012). This study did not show persistence of the civic and political behavior of adolescents (cf. Hooghe, 2004), while others found positive effects in studies among late adolescents with successive measurements within 2 years (Keating & Janmaat, 2015), or more consistent participation throughout the adolescent period (Zaff et al., 2003). The difference between the designs of these studies might explain the lack of positive effects seen in the current study. The timeframe in the current study is six to seven years instead of only one or two years. And in the Netherlands ‘social studies’ as a separate subject is taught in the 10th grade, whereas the students in the aforementioned studies had already received some formal form of citizenship education. This makes it more likely that in our Dutch sample the civic competences could be relatively strongly related to early political socialization in the family environment (cf. Smith, 1999).

Next, and contrary to our third hypothesis that ‘engaged citizenship attitudes will have a stronger relationship with unconventional political participation and civic participation, whereas duty-based citizenship attitudes will be more strongly related with conventional political participation’, it turned out that attitudes of students toward duty-based and engaged citizenship did not make a difference for political and civic participation at a later age. The relation between attitudes toward duty-based and engaged citizenship and political participation was mainly found in the United States (Dalton, 2008b), and these attitudes toward citizenship seem less pronounced in Western Europe (Hooghe & Oser, 2015). Besides, previous research indicated that the approach of duty-based citizenship as one overall dimension is probably not sufficient. The duty to vote is differently valued than paying tax and obeying the law, as these last two duties are not related to political participation (Bolzendahl & Coffé, 2013). And adhering to citizenship attitudes might not automatically lead to actual political participation, as young people are generally prone to be politically passive, although some become active when they perceive that it is needed (Amnå & Ekman, 2013; Amnå & Zetterberg, 2010).

As part of the second model, the background characteristics showed differences for the three forms of participation. Men were usually more active in conventional political activities, but women participated more in unconventional

political and civic behavior. Besides, young adults with a religious background participated more in conventional political activities and civic behavior.

Based on the findings of the differential effects in our two models, we analyzed a third, parsimonious model. Here, the only striking result was a positive association between adolescents' support for democratic values and unconventional political participation. The explanation for this may be that in the full model there was not enough 'power' to detect this effect. From a substantive point of view, there are some indications that adhering to democratic values predicts unconventional political and civic participation (Papanastasiou & Koutselini, 2003), but more empirical research is needed into this matter. The way these democratic values are operationalized, referring to 'protest behavior and 'the right to express their opinions freely', resembles our conception of unconventional political participation to some extent.

Strengths and Limitations

To sum up, this chapter has provided empirical evidence that knowledge of political and civic affairs in adolescence instigates more political participation, and support for democratic values is meaningful for unconventional political participation in young adulthood. The different associations we found of the background characteristics, such as gender and religious background, in relation to the outcome variables indicated that our choice of multivariate models was recommended in this context, as this allowed testing of the background characteristics and predictors across the different outcome variables. At this point, a few shortcomings will be addressed that might have had an influence on the results of this study.

Firstly, in wave two, respondents were asked to cooperate in the interview through various methods including Facebook. This can induce a problem with self-selection as not every young adult has a Facebook account. In the final sample, the respondents scored relatively high on civic knowledge and on SES compared to the total sample of young adults who participated in the ICCS 2009 study. As a result, an overestimation of the amount of political participation is plausible. However, the scores on participation are reasonably low, though there is sufficient variance in the outcome variables. Despite our efforts we did not realize a fully representative sample. Nevertheless, there are no indications that the current sample could lead to a serious bias in estimating the associations between civic competences, extracurricular activities and participation in society since there is no empirical evidence that these associations are moderated by academic and/or socioeconomic status (the variables for which we showed that the sample was not fully representative).

Secondly, the outcome variables differ in their scope. Political participation is measured in an extensive way and in correspondence to the newest forms of political behavior (cf. Theocharis, 2015), whereas civic participation is measured with four items and more specifically focused on the Dutch context. For example, the last indicator of civic participation, ‘giving informal help’, replaces the more internationally used activity, ‘working with others in one’s community to solve a problem’. Some scholars acknowledged that younger people possibly have fewer reasons to invest in their communities (Keeter et al, 2002a), and therefore this indicator might not be suitable for our measurement of civic participation.

Thirdly, survey research is always prone to social desirability. We did not explicitly control for socially desirable answering, but to limit the risk we included questions about whether respondents were willing to participate in the future, as answers to such ‘face-saving questions’ removes the tendency of respondents to give socially desirable answers elsewhere (Persson & Solevid, 2014). Furthermore, to reduce the possibility of the respondent haphazardly filling in answers, in wave 2 the interviewer could monitor the actions and intentions of the respondent. Lastly, the relatively small sample size is a point of concern. A model with more than ten predictors might suffer from a lack of power to detect statistically significant relations. Therefore, a parsimonious model is estimated, to detect the most important associations.

Suggestions for Further Research

Civic knowledge and, to a lesser extent, support for democratic values were identified in the current study as important predictors of political participation. Although the students in the current study had not received formal citizenship education (as a separate subject) at the time of wave 1, both civic knowledge and democratic values are part of most curricula of citizenship education. Previous review studies suggest that a formal citizenship education curriculum, e.g., classroom instruction, plays an important role the development of civic competences (Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, & ten Dam, 2013) and political participation (Manning & Edwards, 2014). In the last few years, the formal requirement of citizenship education has been included more explicitly in the Dutch curriculum. There is no set form of citizenship education, so the kind of citizenship that is promoted may differ between schools or among teachers (Westheimer & Kahne, 2007; Veugelers, 2007; Leenders, Veugels & de Kat, 2008). Veugelers (2007) identifies three main objectives in civic and citizenship education: ‘adapting and discipline’, ‘autonomy and critical thinking’, and ‘social awareness’. Whereas ‘social awareness’ (referring to solidarity

and respecting people with different views) relates largely to our conceptualization of civic participation, 'adapting and discipline' (obedience and good manners) and 'autonomy and critical thinking' (forming a personal opinion) reflect objectives related to conventional and unconventional political participation, respectively. Our results suggest that civic knowledge not only relates to conventional forms of political participation, such as becoming a member of a political party, but also to more unconventional forms, like demonstrating, or boycotting certain products, where the underlying educational objectives aimed at both discipline and autonomy resonate. Social awareness is not only reflected in behavior, but also in attitudes and interaction with others. The latter have not been measured as explicit citizenship outcomes in this study. Pursued citizenship outcomes are not supposed to be participatory by nature. Future research can broaden the horizon by also focusing on how young adults deal with criticism, how they take others into account, and how they deal with diversity in society.

Ideally, considering the development of political orientations (Eckstein, Noack, & Gniewosz, 2012), one or two additional waves should have been added in the intervening years. In this way the results would have been easier to compare with previous research, given that most longitudinal studies have been carried out with shorter time lags (e.g., Dassonneville et al., 2012; Keating & Janmaat, 2015; Quintelier, 2013). In short, further research that will make use of an extra wave, a bigger sample or a more general population can test whether the same conclusions hold and can also help in identifying possible indirect effects. Notwithstanding the difficulties in the current study, contacting respondents from previous large-scale studies seems to be a promising lead for future research into the long-term effects of citizenship education. It is recommended to request students' permission to use their data for future research (e.g., the Belgian Political Panel Study; Hooghe, Dassonneville, & Marien, 2015),

As was pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, the main assumption of citizenship education initiatives is that students will acquire more civic competences and will thus behave more like active citizens as young adults. The current study tested this assumption with a time lag of seven years and found some evidence for the relationship between students' civic competences and political participation. It suggests that civic knowledge predicts political participation and that support for democratic values is related to unconventional political participation. This study was unable to demonstrate a relationship between students' civic competences and civic participation, and between active participation inside and outside school and political and civic participation in young adulthood.

4

The Relation between Adolescents'
Socialization Experiences and their
Political Participation as Young Adults

Abstract

The current chapter aimed to identify whether various socialization experiences in early adolescence, such as interaction with parents, peers, in voluntary associations, in schools, and the use of media, have a different impact on conventional and unconventional types of political participation in young adulthood. The data were derived from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2009—a survey for students in the 8th grade—and a follow-up study in 2015 and 2016 involving interviewing 134 young adults. The results show that political discussions with peers tend to decrease the conventional political participation of young adults who completed pre-vocational education. However, other socialization experiences in early adolescence do not have a direct impact on political participation of young adults.

Introduction

Political research from the last decades has indicated a decline in voter turnout and political engagement among young adults (Fieldhouse, Tranmer, & Russell, 2007; Putnam, 2000). Young adults have become alienated from democratic institutions and seem less politically interested (Henn, Weinstein, & Forrest, 2005). The decay in political participation among young adults primarily concerns traditional or so-called conventional political activities such as voting and becoming a member of a political party (Gaiser, de Rijke, & Spannring, 2010). Unconventional political activities, like peaceful protest activities, signing petitions, and joining boycotts do not seem to fall under this declining trend (e.g., Dalton, 2008; Stockemer & Carbonetti, 2010; Stolle, Hooghe, & Micheletti, 2005; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). Unconventional political activities seem less intensive and less demanding, because there is usually less commitment needed and the activities are open to anyone (Marien, Hooghe, & Quintelier, 2010).

The changing nature of political participation may affect the process of political socialization among adolescents. Traditionally the family has been regarded as the main socialization agent in conveying the importance of voting and other conventional political activities to young people (Jennings & Niemi, 1981; Jennings, Stoker, & Bowers, 2009). The influence of parents in exercising unconventional political activities, however, seems to be more limited (McDevitt & Kioussis, 2007). Next to parents, the engagement of adolescents in unconventional political activities is potentially affected by schools, voluntary associations, their peers and media. In late adolescence (aged 16–18), especially peers and media seem to gain importance as political socializing agents (Amnå, 2012; Quintelier, 2013a). The period of late adolescence coincides with the so-called ‘impressionable years’, when people form their political attitudes and behaviors. As adolescents age, parents may become less important socialization agents, and their influence is expected to be weakened further as the political participation of youngsters shifts from conventional to unconventional activities.

The influence of parents, schools, voluntary associations, peers, and media on political participation, however, is regularly based on adolescents’ intention to participate in political activities during adulthood, or on their participation in school activities. To what extent socializing experiences influence adolescents’ actual political participation in young adulthood is still largely unknown. In the current study, we will assess the long-term associations of socialization experiences

during adolescence on the political participation of young adults using a two-wave panel study. Moreover, the study aims to identify whether the various socialization experiences have a different impact on conventional versus unconventional forms of political participation.

Theoretical Background

In this study, the term political participation will be used in its broadest sense to refer to all the “voluntary activities by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state” (van Deth, 2014, p. 354), or “activities that are targeted towards the sphere of government, state or politics” (p. 357). The political context or the motives of the participant can also point to a political act. To demarcate political participation, the dividing line lies next to acts that are classified as political due to the circumstances under which they take place (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018). In this way, the definition of political participation includes not only traditional and conventional political activities such as voting and membership of political parties, but also more informal, online, and unconventional activities such as political consumption (e.g., buying Fairtrade products in response to the position of farmers in developing countries), signing petitions and posting an article or video about politics online. Whether online activism is actually a distinctive form of offline participation, or whether it is only participation in another place, still remains a subject of debate (Hirzalla & Zoonen, 2010; Oser, Hooghe, & Marien, 2012). It looks like participation of young adults is independent of place (online or offline), because research has failed to identify a group of respondents who solely participate in online political activities (Oser et al., 2012). One way or another, online activism is an important mode to identify within the broader repertoire of political participation (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018).

In this study, political socialization is framed from a micro perspective (Sapiro, 2004). In this perspective on the process of socialization of individuals, attention is focused on when political socialization takes place and which actors influence the political development. Current scientific literature focuses on political socialization during adolescence and young adulthood (Neundorff & Smets, 2017). To gain insight into the development and change of political orientations and behavior, political learning between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five seems appropriate to examine (Niemi & Hepburn, 1995). The interest of political

socialization within this age group is based on a number of perspectives, two of which are further explained.

One is the persistence model, in which political orientations are formed in childhood and early adolescence and persist through the course of life (Sears & Levy, 2003). A specific variant has also been formulated: the hypothesis that orientations are mainly formed in late adolescence ('the impressionable years') and remain stable thereafter (Sears & Levy, 2003). These views on political socialization are contrasted by the lifelong openness model, in which adults can still be influenced in their political orientations. Empirical studies support the impressionable years hypothesis (Jennings et al., 2009; Neundorf, Smets & Garcia-Albacete, 2013), although age limits seem context-dependent (Neundorf & Smets, 2017). In young adulthood, political orientations stabilize (Neundorf, Niemi, & Smets, 2015; Russo & Stattin, 2016).

In the remainder of the section we discuss which socialization experiences (in diverse contexts) influence political orientations in adolescence and early adulthood. Traditionally, parents have been attributed a major role in the political socialization of their children, but interactions with peers, the media, and in volunteer organizations have also been examined more recently (Neundorf & Smets, 2017; Quintelier, 2013a). Interactions with parents are considered the main socialization experience for young people, as the first discussions and experiences with politics usually take place within the family context (Quintelier, 2013a). From early on, political socialization takes place through direct transfer of political values as well as indirect transfer through the political climate within the family, shaped by the political activities of parents and the socioeconomic environment (Hooghe & Boonen, 2015; Jennings et al., 2009). A politicized family context provides access to more sources of political information (McIntosh et al., 2007). These sources, such as political discussions, newspapers, electronic media, and books, help to socialize children and give them notions of the functioning of politics, democracy, and democratic institutions. Growing up in a politicized family has a positive influence on participation in conventional activities, such as voting and becoming a member of a political party (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Furthermore, adolescents who discuss political events with their parents are more likely to be involved in unconventional political and civic activities, such as signing petitions and community work (Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, & Keeter, 2003; Kahne & Sporte, 2008; McIntosh, Hart, & Youniss, 2007). Adolescents from families who pay little or no attention to politics might not undergo this process of socialization

to the same extent. These adolescents, usually from families with a lower socio-economic background, in particular seem to benefit from citizenship education at school (Gainous & Martens, 2011; Neundorff, Niemi, & Smets, 2016).

Schools are also considered institutions in which political socialization occur (Amnå, 2012). Citizenship education is the most important part of this socialization, and is focused on instilling political and civic awareness. Longitudinal studies investigating long-term effects of citizenship education indicate an influence of school-based political activities (from grade 6 onwards) on conventional political participation as a young adult (aged 19-20) (Keating & Janmaat, 2015; Zaff, Moore, Papillo, & Williams, 2003). It seems that, in particular, structural attention for citizenship at secondary schools can bring about these effects (Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy, & Lopes, 2010; Pasek, Feldman, Romer, & Jamieson, 2008). Next to the traditional civic classes, the effect of an open classroom climate on political participation seems significant (Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, & Dam, 2013; Isac, Maslowski, Creemers, & van der Werf, 2013). An open classroom climate is a learning environment that is focused on a free dialogue about political and social issues and is associated with higher civic and political knowledge (Persson, 2014).

Moreover, involvement of adolescents in voluntary associations is a promising activity for fostering both conventional and unconventional political participation later on. Early involvement in voluntary associations in general (McFarland & Thomas, 2006), and civic and political activities during middle and high school (from 14 years old) (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007), lead to more political participation at a later age (till 26 years old). Adolescents develop a habit of being active in these voluntary organizations and build a circle of friends that can mobilize them for political-oriented activities. Sometimes this effect only occurs in late adulthood, after a period of inactivity in early adulthood (Jennings & Stoker, 2004). A comment on the involvement in voluntary associations is that association could function as a selection mechanism, whereby only active persons are mobilized to political participation (van Ingen & van der Meer, 2016).

As adolescents grow older, peers become more important as a socialization agent. In late adolescence, discussions with peers and access to media are linked with more political participation in both conventional and unconventional activities (Moeller & de Vreese, 2013; Quintelier, 2013a; Serek & Umemura, 2015). Political discussion among peers is more strongly related to political outcomes in comparison with political discussion with parents (Ekström & Östman, 2013). Findings of panel data over a period of one year showed that young people who

frequently discuss politics with their peers are characterized by higher voting intentions and subsequent electoral participation (Serek & Umemura, 2015). And especially older adolescents are more inclined to volunteer, if their friends are also volunteers (van Goethem, van Hoof, van Aken, Orobio de Castro, & Raaijmakers, 2014). In this respect, spending time with politically or civically active peers provides additional opportunities to participate in political activities.

Unconventional political activities, such as signing petitions and boycotting products, are increasingly taking place online. The media therefore take an important place, both for providing political information and for (online) participation itself (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011). Most research findings point in the direction of a positive relation between use of media and conventional and unconventional political participation. Traditional media use, such as reading newspapers and watching the news, depends more on parents providing access to sources of political information than digital media use. As far as television is concerned, only programs with political content have a positive effect on political participation (Quintelier & Hooghe, 2011). Besides traditional media, the use of internet and social media with regard to political information also has positive effects on political activities (Boulianne, 2015; Holt, Shehata, Strömbäck, & Ljungberg, 2013; Xenos, Vromen, & Loader, 2014), although most studies showing this positive association are cross-sectional in nature. A Belgian panel study indicated that use of social network sites is not related to political participation over time (Theocharis & Quintelier, 2014). Despite the vast amount of political information and increasing political activities on social media, young people who are not politically interested will not become politically involved via social media (Keating & Melis, 2017).

The aim of this study is to identify the long-term influence of six features of socialization experiences—parents, schools, voluntary associations, peers, tradition media and the Internet—on both conventional and unconventional political participation. Previous studies in this field did not make a clear distinction between these two forms of participation, and therefore could not grasp the tendency of young adults to participate more in unconventional political activities. In addition, the role of parents is only associated with conventional political participation, but the relation with unconventional political participation is still uncertain. At the same time, almost all of these former studies are based on adolescents' intention to participate in political activities, whereas this study focuses on actual political participation during young adulthood.

Method

Sample

The analysis was based on a longitudinal panel design consisting of two waves. The first wave is derived from the Dutch cohort in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009 (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). In 2009, Grade 8 students, who were approximately 14 years old at that time, completed a civic knowledge test and questionnaire. The ICCS sampling method was based on a two-stage stratified cluster design (Schulz et al., 2010). First, approximately 150 secondary schools in each country were sampled using a probability proportional to school size. Second, from each selected school one or two intact classes were sampled. In total 2,491 students in 85 schools in the Netherlands participated in the study.

The second wave took place in 2015 and 2016. For this wave 1,493 young adults who participated in the 2009 ICCS study were selected.¹⁰ Various methods were used to contact young adults. First, as all young adults had left secondary education, they were contacted through their Facebook pages. Second, a snowball method was used to get in touch with former classmates of the responding young adults. Third, the 2009 home addresses of students were retrieved via their former secondary school. These addresses were used to retrieve their current addresses from municipal administration files. Based on these methods, contact data of 992 young adults could be retrieved (see Figure 1 in Chapter 3).

A total of 178 contacted young adults agreed to participate in the study. 50 young adults explicitly indicated that they were not willing to participate, and 764 contacted persons did not respond to our invitation to participate, after several reminders. Of the 178 persons who were willing to participate, 134 persons actually participated. Others did not react to follow-up contacts to make an appointment, or cancelled the appointment.

As soon as a respondent agreed to participate, an appointment was scheduled with an interviewer by e-mail. This interview took place at a convenient place for the respondent, for instance: at home, school or work. Structured interviews were conducted by student assistants using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI). The interviewers were trained in advance in order to ensure standardization

10 As young adults were interviewed face-to-face, only young adults were selected whose parental addresses were reachable by public transport within a time frame of 90 minutes.

of the interviewing. Using CAPI, the instructions and questions for respondents were standardized. A regular interview took about 35 minutes.

For each individual respondent, the ICCS surveys responses of the first wave were matched to the interview responses from the second wave using a unique student identifier. Comparing the 134 participants in the second wave with the remainder of the ICCS sample of 2,357 respondents, analyses showed that there were no substantial differences in the distribution of gender ($\phi = -0.024$, $p = 0.225$) and religious background ($\phi = -0.037$, $p = 0.067$). However, participants in the study generally had a higher socioeconomic status (parental occupation $d = .49$ and parental education $d = .39$) and higher scores on a few political attitudes and participation in the community in Grade 8 (democratic values $d = 0.16$, political trust $d = .20$, and participation in the community $d = 0.21$). This is mainly caused by an underrepresentation of students from the pre-vocational track (21 participants) compared to students from the academic tracks ('senior general secondary education' and 'pre-university education', equaling 113 participants) in the second wave. For the academic tracks, no substantial deviations were found between the 2015/2016 sample and the 2009 sample (1,423 students in academic tracks) for gender, religious background, as well as political attitudes and students' participation in the community.¹¹ Only for socioeconomic status (parental occupation $d = 0.40$, and parental education $d = 0.30$) did the two waves differ for students in academic tracks.

Variables and Instruments

Dependent variables

In the second wave, the respondents were asked whether they participated in 33 different political activities during the past year. For each political activity respondents indicated either 'No, I did not participate over the past 12 months' (coded as 0) or 'Yes, I participated over the past 12 months' (coded as 1). Using Mokken Scale Analysis (MSA) (Molenaar & Sijtsma, 2000), two scales of political participation were created based on the PAYA inventory of Chapter 2, one indicating conventional and one indicating unconventional political participation.

11 The distribution of gender ($\phi = -0.025$, $p = 0.331$), religious background ($\phi = -0.039$, $p = 0.134$) political attitudes (democratic values $d = -0.01$ and political trust $d = 0.14$) and participation in the community ($d = -.24$) were almost equal in the 2016 and 2009 samples of students in academic tracks.

Conventional political participation. The Conventional Political Participation scale consisted of ten items. Item examples were: ‘Contacted a political party’; ‘Worn or displayed a badge/sticker/T-shirt stating a political message’; and ‘Signed up for a political e-news bulletin’. The general scale coefficient H had a value of .45, which pointed to a medium-strong cumulative scale.¹² The means for the individual items, as well as the H_i -coefficients, are reported in Table 1 in Chapter 3. The H_i -coefficients reflected the fit of the items in the scale, and range from .38 to .56, which is well above the lower bound of .3 (Sijtsma, Debets, & Molenaar, 1990)

Unconventional political participation. The Unconventional Political Participation scale consisted of ten items. Item examples were: ‘Took part in a public demonstration’; ‘Responded positively to an invitation for a political meeting by a friend or group’; and ‘Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons’. The general scale coefficient $H = 0.46$ for unconventional political participation indicated a medium-strong cumulative scale. The H_i -coefficients indicated a good fit and range from .31 to .57 (see Table 1 in Chapter 3).

Independent variables

Political discussion with parents. ICCS 2009 included two items concerning political discussion with parents. The two items, ‘How often do you talk about political and social issues with your parent(s)?’, and ‘How often do you talk about what is happening in other countries with your parent(s)?’, were combined and averaged. Answers were given on a 4-point scale ranging from (1) (*almost*) *never* to (4) (*almost*) *daily*.

Open classroom climate. Six items from ICCS 2009 were used to measure students’ perceptions of openness in classroom discussions (eigenvalue 2.50; explained variance: 41.71). Answer options were ranging from (1) *never* to (4) *often*. Two example items were: ‘Teachers encourage students to express their opinions’; and ‘Teachers encourage students to discuss the issues with people having different opinions’ (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 170). Cronbach’s alpha of the scale (where the items were averaged) was 0.71.

12 Loevingers Homogeneity Coefficient (H) is an indicator of the quality of a scale as a whole, wherein $H < 0.3$ indicates a non-scalable set of items, $0.3 \leq H < 0.4$ indicates a weak scale, $0.4 \leq H < 0.5$ indicates a medium-strong scale and $H \geq 0.5$ represents a strong scale (Sijtsma, Debets & Molenaar, 1990).

Involvement in societal and political associations. ICCS 2009 measured involvement in a diverse range of societal and political organizations. Students were asked to indicate whether they participated in eight organizations and their activities, for example: an environmental organization; a human rights organization; and an organization collecting money for a social cause (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p. 167–168). Answer categories were: *within the last 12 months*, *more than a year ago*, or *never*. The response ‘never’ was recoded as *no* (0) and the other two categories as *yes* (1). The responses were summed to an index representing the number of organizations in which a respondent was active.

Political discussion with friends. ICCS 2009 contained two items covering political discussion with friends. The two items, ‘How often do you talk about political and social issues with friends?’ and ‘How often do you talk about what is happening in other countries with friends’, were combined and averaged. Answers were given on a 4-point scale ranging from (1) *(almost) never* to (4) *(almost) daily*.

Traditional media use. Two items from ICCS 2009 were combined as an average to form the construct of Traditional media use: ‘Reading a newspaper’ and ‘Watching the news on TV to follow politics and current events’. Answers ranged from (1) *never or hardly ever* to (4) *daily or almost daily*.

Internet use regarding political and social issues. ICCS 2009 included one question about Internet use for political purposes: ‘How often do you use the internet to follow politics and current events?’ The answers categories were (1) *never or hardly ever* to (4) *daily or almost daily*.

Control variables

A number of control variables which are traditionally related to political participation have been included in the analysis. The first control variable *Gender* was coded as follows: 0 for boys and 1 for girls. For *Religious affiliation* a question was asked whether the respondents identified themselves with a religion. Categories of religious affiliation were dichotomized as (0) not identifying with any religion, and (1) identifying with a religion (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2010, p. 107). *Socioeconomic status* was a combination of three indices: (i) highest occupational status of one of the parents (HISEI), (ii) number of books at home, and (iii) highest educational level of one of the parents (HISCED). HISEI was measured via the International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (Ganzeboom, de Graaf, & Treiman, 1992). For books at home, students were asked, ‘Approximately, how many books are in your home?’, ranging from (0) 0–10 books to (5) more than 500 books. HISCED

is measured in number of educational years (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.193). *Educational level* represented the educational track of students in secondary school, with *pre-vocational track* coded 0, *senior general secondary track* coded 1, and *pre-university track* coded 2. Two dummy variables were constructed, using pre-vocational track as reference category.

Data Analysis

First, descriptive statistics and bivariate associations between variables were presented. Then, using MPlus version 7.31 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012), a multiple multivariate regression analysis was performed (with Maximum Likelihood estimator) to assess the influence of the socialization experiences on political participation. In advance, there was a check for dependency in the data caused by the multilevel structure of wave 1 (ICCS 2009), and this analysis showed zero intra-class correlation in the dependent variables. Therefore, it was decided to not conduct a multilevel analysis. Most of the covariances between the independent variables were constrained to zero, except for the indicated associations in former empirical research, such as the covariance between political discussion with parents and friends, and between SES and educational level.

The analysis consisted of several steps. In the first model, the control variables were included as predictors of conventional and unconventional political participation.¹³ In the second model, only the influence of four socialization experiences was tested, by including the six independent variables as described above. In the third model, the socialization indicators were added to the model with the control variables. Standardized coefficients were reported in order to allow for a comparison of the relative impact of the socialization experiences. In the fourth and last model, interaction effects of educational level and the four socialization experiences were tested. For this last model, the unstandardized coefficients were reported in order to interpret the results of the interaction variables, as the standardized coefficients for the interaction terms are not properly standardized (Frazier, Tix, & Baron, 2004). Finally, a robustness test was performed, where both forms of political participation were dichotomized and assessed by means of a logistic regression analysis (see Appendix B).

13 The distribution of conventional political participation was positively skewed and in the multivariate analysis the assumption of the normality of residuals was violated. Therefore a square root transformation was performed to use the variable in the analysis (cf. Field, 2009: p.155).

Results

Table 1 contains descriptive information on the dependent, independent and control variables in our study. Conventional political participation had a mean value of 1.61 and standard deviation of 1.88. Young adults thus participated in only a few conventional political activities and they vary considerably in the number of activities they participated in. Unconventional political participation had a mean value of 2.87 and standard deviation of 2.26. In general, the young adults in the current sample participated slightly more in unconventional political activities than in conventional activities: $t(133) = -7.36, p < 0.001$.

As Table 1 reveals, conventional political participation had a positive association with unconventional political participation, $r(134) = .56; p < .001$. Furthermore, adolescents who stated that they talk about politics with their parents, $r(134) = .43; p < .001$, and friends, $r(134) = .45; p < .001$, made more use of the Internet for political purposes. Moreover, adolescents who talked about politics with their parents were also inclined to talk about politics with their friends, $r(134) = .59; p < .001$.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations of all the Variables used in the Analysis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Mean	SD	N
1 Conventional Political Participation	-												1.61	1.88	134
2 Unconventional Political Participation	.54**	-											2.87	2.26	134
3 Political Discus. Parents	.09	.11	-										2.12	.87	134
4 Open Classroom Climate	.08	.19*	.18*	-									2.84	.53	134
5 Involvement Assoc.	.09	.09	.20*	.06	-								1.73	1.33	132
6 Political Discussion Friends	.07	.20*	.59**	.21*	.13	-							1.63	.70	134
7 Traditional Media Use	.11	.12	.38**	.05	.15	.25**	-						2.63	.88	134
8 Internet Media Use	.13	.07	.43**	.16	.13	.45**	.27**						1.86	.98	134
9 Socio Economic Status	.19*	.23*	.33**	.09	.05	.23*	.11*	.22	-				.00	1.00	134
10 Gender	-.18*	.15	.12	.25**	.18*	.10	.01	.06	-.10	-			51.5% male		134
11 Religious Affiliation	.19*	.06	-.05	-.03	.10	-.08	.01	-.04	-.12	.04	-		44.4% yes		133
12 Educational Level ¹	.23**	.30**	.28**	.16	-.05	.29**	.19*	.22*	.37**	-.01	-.04	-			134

Note. Involvement Assoc. = Involvement in societal and political associations.

¹Spearman rank order correlations for Educational Level, distribution: 15.7% Pre-vocational, 28.4% General secondary, 56% Pre-university.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 2 shows the results of the multiple multivariate regression analyses predicting conventional and unconventional political participation. The first model of conventional and unconventional political participation with five background variables, $\chi^2(10) = 43.08$, $p < .001$, fitted significantly better than an empty model (with the regression coefficients constrained to 0). In Model 1, both gender ($\beta = -.20$, $p = .012$) and religious affiliation ($\beta = .21$, $p = .008$) were related to conventional political participation, explaining 16 percent of the variance. Young men and religious students participated more in conventional political activities than young women and non-religious students. For unconventional political participation, the predictors of pre-university education ($\beta = .35$, $p = .003$) and socioeconomic status were statistically significant ($\beta = .17$, $p = .043$). Students in the academic track participated more in unconventional political activities than students in the pre-vocational track, and students with a higher socioeconomic status participated more in unconventional political activities than those with a lower socioeconomic status. Model 1 explained 15 percent of the variance in unconventional political participation.

In Model 2, the 'gross' effects of socialization experiences on political participation in young adulthood was examined. The six indicators explained respectively two and five percent of the variance in conventional and unconventional political participation in early adulthood. The model did not have a good fit, $\chi^2(12) = 14.33$, $p = .28$, suggesting that the fit is not better than in the constrained model (in which all regression coefficients were 0). None of the socialization indicators were statistically significant predictors of conventional and unconventional political participation.

In Model 3, background characteristics were added to Model 2 (see Table 2). The test for the overall model, $\chi^2(22) = 53.92$, $p < .001$, indicated that Model 3 fits significantly better than a model with all the regression coefficients constrained to 0. Model 3 explained 17 percent of the variance in conventional political participation. As for Model 1, gender and religious affiliation were statistically significant predictors of conventional political participation ($\beta = -.22$, $p = .007$ and $\beta = .20$, $p = .014$). In the third model for unconventional political participation, pre-university education ($\beta = .33$, $p = .004$) and socioeconomic status ($\beta = .19$, $p = .030$) were again statistically significant predictors. Just like in Model 2, none of the socialization indicators was a statistical significant predictor of conventional and unconventional political participation. Model 3 explained 18 percent of the variance in unconventional political participation.

Table 2
Multivariate Regression Analysis of Political Participation on Socialization Experiences

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4 #	
	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Conv.	Unconv.
Constant	.96 (.24)	.50 (.23)	1.30 (.12)	1.28 (.12)	1.03 (.24)	.57 (.24)	.53 (.23)	.91 (.66)
Gender	-.18* (.08)	.16* (.08)			-.22** (.08)	.13 (.08)	-.27* (.13)	.71† (.38)
Religion	.21** (.08)	.06 (.08)			.20* (.08)	.06 (.08)	.40** (.14)	.45 (.39)
SES	.14 (.09)	.18* (.09)			.11 (.09)	.19* (.08)	.09 (.13)	.36† (.20)
General Secondary Education ^(a)	.09 (.12)	.22† (.12)			.08 (.12)	.20† (.12)	.33 (.24)	1.23† (.69)
Pre-University Education ^(a)	.24* (.12)	.36** (.12)			.22† (.12)	.33** (.12)	.53* (.23)	1.78** (.66)
Pol. Discussion Parents			.01 (.11)	-.05 (.11)	-.02 (.11)	-.13 (.11)	.55† (.32)	-.07 (.93)
Open Classroom Climate			.06 (.09)	.17† (.09)	.10 (.08)	.11 (.08)	.06 (.18)	.13 (.53)
Involvement Associations			.06 (.09)	.06 (.09)	.10 (.08)	.06 (.08)	.21 (.15)	.55 (.44)
Pol. Discussion Friends			-.02 (.11)	.18† (.11)	-.04 (.10)	.14 (.10)	-.78* (.37)	-.06 (1.06)
Traditional Media			.07 (.09)	.09 (.09)	.03 (.09)	.07 (.09)	-.05 (.21)	-.17 (.63)
Internet Media			.10 (.10)	-.05 (.10)	.08 (.09)	-.08 (.09)	-.01 (.22)	-.17 (.67)
PDP x GS							-.64† (.36)	-.33 (1.06)

Table 2 (continued)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4 #	
	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Conv.	Unconv.
Constant	.96 (.24)	.50 (.23)	1.30 (.12)	1.28 (.12)	1.03 (.24)	.57 (.24)	.53 (.23)	.91 (.66)
PDP x Uni							-.57† (.34)	-.22 (.98)
OCC x GS							-.05 (.22)	-.19 (.63)
OCC x Uni							.04 (.20)	.31 (.59)
IA x GS							-.64 (.36)	-.33 (1.07)
IA x Uni							-.57 (.34)	-.22 (.98)
PDF x GS							.77† (.42)	.12 (1.10)
PDF x Uni							.78* (.38)	.44 (1.21)
TM x GS							-.01 (.25)	.02 (.74)
TM x Uni							.10 (.23)	.48 (.68)
IM x GS							.24 (.29)	.77 (.85)
IM x Uni							.03 (.24)	-.09 (.72)
Partial correlation								
	.55		.55		.55		.55	
Model fit								
R ²	.16	.15	.03	.06	.17	.18	.22	.22
χ ² (df)	43.08** (10)		14.33 (12)		53.92** (22)		86.00* (46)	

Note. ^(a) Reference category = Pre-Vocational Education.

Beta (S.E.) are displayed. #, for interaction model 4 the unstandardized coefficients B are reported.

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$ and † $p < .1$

In the final model, Model 4, interaction terms of the socialization indicators and educational level were included: $\chi^2(46) = 68,00$, $p = 0.019$. Model 4, with interactions, fitted significantly better than the constrained model. For conventional political participation, two statistical significant main effects and one interaction effect were detected, namely the main effects of pre-university track ($b = .53$, $p = .018$) and political discussion with friends ($b = -.77$, $p = .035$), and their interaction ($b = .78$, $p = .040$). These findings suggest that talking about politics with friends has a negative effect on the participation in conventional political activities for young adults from the pre-vocational track (see Figure 2). In other words, the difference in conventional political participation between young adults with a pre-university degree and those with a pre-vocational degree widened when the latter were, as adolescents, more engaged in political discussions with their friends. Regarding unconventional political participation, none of the interaction effects was statistically significant.

Figure 2. Conventional political participation as a function of political discussion with friends and educational track.

To check the robustness of these findings regarding political participation, we also conducted a logistic regression analysis (see Appendix B). Both political participation scales were dichotomized. Accordingly, 72% of the young adults parti-

cipated in at least one conventional political activity, and 83% participated in at least one unconventional political activity. The results of the logistic regression analysis were largely similar to the results of the previous analysis. Again, there were no significant effects of the socialization indicators on political participation. The only noticeable difference was that the effects of educational level on both forms of political participation were not significant.

Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, the long-term effects of different socialization experiences during adolescence (14 year olds) on the political participation of young adults (21 year olds) were examined. For that purpose, a distinction was made between conventional political participation and unconventional political participation. This distinction is based on the assumption that young adults are more inclined to participate in unconventional political activities, like taking part in a protest march or signing a petition, than in conventional activities, like contacting or becoming a member of a political party.

The current study indicated that there were no relations between important socialization experiences in early adolescence and political participation seven years later. Previous studies did show that political discussions with parents, an open classroom climate, involvement in voluntary associations, political discussion with friends, as well as using media to gain information on social and political issues affected the political participation of adolescents and young adults (e.g., Hart et al., 2007; Jennings et al., 2009; McIntosh et al., 2007; Quintelier, 2013a, Xenos et al., 2014), although these studies concerned diverse forms of political engagement and participation and were largely based on a population aged 16 and older. Unlike findings of other studies (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011, Ekström & Östman, 2013; Leyva, 2017), we found that political discussions with parents did not affect conventional political participation of young adults, and discussions with friends and using media to gain information did not have a greater effect on unconventional than conventional forms of participation. Discussing the lack of a positive effect of talking about politics at home and with friends (e.g., McIntosh et al., 2007; Serek & Umemura, 2015), it might be that political discussion with friends work best for political participation when adolescents have prior experience with political behavior (Klofstad, 2009). In the current study, the adolescents, on average 14 years old, hardly had experience with political participation, since they

generally come into contact with political activities later in adolescence (i.e., via mock elections, service learning, student council).

The lack of effects might also be explained by the instability of political orientations in early adolescence. Eckstein, Noack, and Gwienosz (2012) showed that students' attitudes toward political engagement and their willingness to participate in political activities were very unstable in early adolescence (aged 13 to 15). This means that in our study, where socialization experiences were measured at the age of 14, we possibly found less evidence of an association with political participation later on, compared to late adolescence when political awareness and interest is more developed (Neundorf et al., 2013). In this respect, it is not surprising that former studies based on smaller time frames and older adolescents do find effects of socialization experiences on political participation.

A possible explanation for the fact that we did not find effects on participation for using media to inform oneself on political and social issues, or on what is happening in other countries, might be partly due to the fact that only a relatively small proportion of the 14-year-old students read a newspaper regularly, i.e. at least once a week (Maslowski et al., 2012). Although students who regularly read a newspaper or watch the television news were more interested in political and social issues than those who did not, the relationship between obtaining news and political interest in early adolescence was rather weak. With regard to obtaining information on political and social issues through Internet sources, using online resources was still relatively uncommon in 2009 (Maslowski et al., 2012).

Surprisingly, we showed that for pre-vocational students, discussing politics with friends in early adolescence is negatively related to conventional political participation. So, considering adolescents who discuss politics with their friends, this study indicates that young adults from the pre-vocational track are less inclined to participate in conventional political activities than their peers from the pre-university and secondary education tracks. It is difficult to point to the cause of the finding that adolescents from the pre-vocational track, who discuss politics with their friends more often, are less inclined to participate in conventional political activities. This may indicate that other mechanisms are at play for pre-vocational and pre-university students. Pre-vocational students are usually less politically interested, and grow up in less politicized families (e.g., Neundorf, Smets, & Garcia-Albacete, 2013). One might expect that those pre-vocational students who discuss political and social issues with friends are particularly politically interested, and thus might be more inclined to become politically active in later life. A possible explanation of the

finding might be that pre-vocational students more often talk negatively about politics with their friends, which prohibits them from becoming political active in adulthood. In this case they will not perceive social support from friends to participate, and are less likely to engage in conventional political activities (Glasford, 2008). This raises questions for further research about circumstances where political discussion plays a negative role in fostering political participation. For example, political discussion with politically alienated friends may lead to political passivity rather than political participation (Dahl et al., 2018).

Beyond the findings regarding the influence of socialization experiences, it is worth noting that our study revealed no significant effect of socioeconomic status on conventional political participation in adulthood. This might partly be caused by including the educational track of students in the analyses, as we showed that students in the academic track, compared to students in the pre-vocational track, participated more in conventional political activities. There is a possible trade-off between the actual educational level of the student and their socioeconomic family background. Both indicators point to the importance of the socioeconomic status of the student in the act of political participation (Verba et al., 1995). This positive correlation between educational level and political participation is empirically well substantiated (Dee, 2004; Hoskins & Janmaat, 2016; Verba et al., 1995). Attending higher education is likely to serve as a proxy for unobserved pre-adult experiences and dispositions (Kam & Palmer, 2008), possible factors that foster political participation. For example, both among pre-vocational and pre-university students, discussions with friends reflect an interest in political and social issues, but only pre-university students have the resources and network to become active (Klofstad, 2007). Political participation, as Verba et al. (1995) argued, is not only dependent on political interest, but also on time available and civic skills, as well as being part of a network that mobilizes people to become active. Without these resources and networks, young adults need to overcome extra hurdles to become politically active. Future research is needed to examine how such circumstances moderate the relationship between political discussion and participation. Educational level lacks an association with political participation, once pre-adult dispositions, such as general cognitive level, are taken into account (Kam & Palmer, 2008; 2011)—although these findings are disputed by Mayer (2011), among others. A more recent study by Hooghe, Dasonneville, and Marien (2015), however, confirmed the effect of educational track on political trust of young adults.

This study dealt with a number of methodological issues that might have an influence on the validity and reliability of the results. First, in the follow-up wave respondents were asked to take part in the interview via Facebook. This can induce a problem with self-selection as not every young adult is on Facebook. Besides, generally those who are well-educated and like the topic of the study will participate. Consequently, an inadequate representation (overestimation) of the amount of political participation is likely. As far as estimating the relationship between political socializing agents and political participation is concerned, this could imply that the observed mechanisms only hold for young adults who are relatively interested in political and social issues. Further studies are needed to examine whether the observed relationships are representative of other young adults as well.

The concern of representativeness of answers is also linked to the possibility of social desirable answers. Interviewer-administered survey research is prone to social desirability, because it is not completely anonymous, but there are clearly advantages in the sense of motivating respondents and clarifying questions (Klausch, Hox, & Schouten, 2013). To reduce the possibility of haphazardly filling in answers, a threat in self-administered surveys, in the follow-up wave the interviewer could monitor the actions and intentions of the respondent. Lastly, the relatively small sample size is a point of concern in assessing the fourth model with all moderator variables. A model with more than ten predictors might suffer from a lack of power to detect statistically significant relations.

As we had to rely on data from the 2009 ICCS study, our findings might be affected by the fact that we only could use a couple of items to measure interactions with parents and peers (i.e., the frequency of discussing political and social issues, and the frequency of discussing what is happening in the world). Although these items capture some core features of how parents and friends might influence the political interest and commitment of adolescents, they do not capture other relevant aspects, like the political participation of the parents (Cicognani, Zani, Fournier, Gavray, & Born, 2012) or the political diversity in the peer group (Quintelier, 2013). Similarly, the influence of associations and the media were measured using the membership of voluntary associations and the frequency of media use to obtain information on political and social issues. These measures do not entail detailed information on the interactions with others in those associations, or the type, amount and quality of information obtained from newspapers, television news or Internet sources.

A lot is going on in the transition from adolescence to young adulthood and it will be a challenge for future research to set up the right indicators to measure some of the events that take place in this formative period. Although the timeframe in the current study is sufficiently large, future research could add an additional, in-between wave and take civic experiences that translate intentions to behavior in late adolescence, such as mock elections or service learning, into consideration. Quintelier (2013b) noted that more effort should be made to compare the relative effect of the different socialization experiences at different time points, and research might also look more in more detail at which socialization experience is most effective at a certain point in time. Looking into this last notion, a recent longitudinal panel study found no support for the claim that involvement in voluntary associations boosts political participation in a general population (van Ingen & van de Meer, 2016), but it could be that this may only be the case for adolescents (McFarland & Thomas 2006). Further panel research could confirm such specific effects of socialization experiences on political participation.

All things considered, the results of this longitudinal study indicate that socialization experiences in early adolescence do not have a direct impact on political participation of young adults. As far as the discussion of politics with friends is concerned, the study even provides an indication that this experience negatively affects the political participation of young adults from the pre-vocational track, who are already less inclined to participate than their higher educated peers. Different outcomes can be expected when comparing the effect of socialization experiences in different stages of life. Future studies should look into the period of middle and late adolescence to assess the influence of the peer group and the media on the political activities of young adults.

5

The Relation between Adolescents'
Academic Achievement and Their
Participation in Society as Young Adults

Abstract

This chapter assessed the longitudinal relationship between adolescents' academic achievement and their conventional and unconventional political and civic participation in young adulthood. Data from 111 Dutch adolescents in the academic tracks, who participated in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009 (14-year-old students) and a follow-up subsample in 2015 and 2016 (21 year olds) were used. National examination scores on three mandatory core subjects in the Dutch curriculum were used to assess their relationship with participation in society in a multivariate multiple regression analysis. The results highlight different associations between citizenship education indicators, educational achievement in general subjects, and civic and political participation in young adulthood. Empirical evidence is provided that adolescents with higher final examination grades in mathematics participate more frequently in civic activities in young adulthood, after controlling for background characteristics. In contrast, the relationship between educational achievement and political participation was absent.

Introduction

Over the past decades, many European countries have adopted or intensified civic and citizenship education in their curricula (EACEA, 2016, 2017). Although countries differ with regard to whether citizenship education is provided as a cross-curricular theme, a separate subject, integrated into other subjects or domains or a combination of these various forms, the aim behind providing a civic and citizenship education program is often the same: to counter the perceived disengagement of young people in civic and political life (Putnam, 2000; Schuitema, ten Dam, & Veugelers, 2008; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010).

The assumption of providing citizenship education is that students will acquire more civic competences and will become more active citizens as they reach adulthood. Active citizens are those who participate in society, which is divided into political and civic participation (Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). Studies in the 1990s indicated that citizenship education had a positive impact on students' civic and political knowledge (Denver & Hands, 1990; Niemi & Junn, 1998). In a review of 28 empirical studies into the effects of citizenship education between 2003 and 2009, Geboers, Geijssels, Admiraal, and ten Dam (2013) concluded that there are strong indications that providing citizenship education through the curriculum has a positive effect on students' knowledge of democratic principles and their attitudes toward democracy. For other forms of civic and citizenship education, such as engaging in extracurricular activities, most studies reported only small effects, whereas effects for citizenship education in out-of-school curricula were absent in a vast majority of the studies.

Compared to studies into the effect of civic and citizenship education on civic and citizenship competences, research into the effects on students' actual participation is relatively sparse. Until recently most of these studies focused on either participation in school activities, such as being a class representative or voting for the student council, or on students' intention to participate in political and civic activities in later life, such as their intention to vote (cf. Schulz et al., 2010; Torney-Purta, 2002). A systematic review into the effects of citizenship education curricula on actual political participation revealed that the evidence so far is still inconclusive (Manning & Edwards, 2014). Most of the studies Manning and Edwards reviewed concerning 'formal' political participation, like voting and registering to vote, reported no significant effects of civic classes or specific civic education programs (e.g., Bers & Chau, 2010; Callahan, Muller, & Schiller, 2010; Gershtenson, Rainey, & Rainey, 2010; McDevitt & Kioussis, 2006; Pasek,

Feldman, Romer, & Jamieson, 2008). However, when looking at ‘expressive’ forms of political participation, such as signing a petition or contacting a public official, civic education seemed to have clearer positive effects (e.g., Bers & Chau, 2010; Crawford, 2010; Saha, 2000). A similar conclusion is to be drawn from longitudinal studies into the effects of civic and citizenship education on civic participation (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss, & Atkins, 2007; McFarland & Thomas, 2006).

An alternative hypothesis is that political and civic participation is not induced by students’ civic and citizenship education specifically, but is rather the result of students’ general educational attainment. Numerous studies reveal that highly educated persons participate more often in political and civic activities than less educated persons (Putnam, 2000; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). The classical line of Converse (1972) is often quoted in this context: “education is everywhere the universal solvent, and the relationship is always in the same direction. The higher the education, the greater the ‘good’ values of the variable” (p. 324). Following this line of thought, the content of education does not matter per se (Campbell, 2006). General education not only enhances cognitive capacity, analytic ability, and civic skills (Eidhof, ten Dam, Dijkstra, & van de Werfhorst, 2016; Hauser, 2000), but also influences political interest and political efficacy; and all these factors are important in political and civic participation (Campbell, 2006; Verba et al., 1995). Scholars refer to this as the ‘absolute education’ effect on participation in society (e.g., Persson, 2015; Persson & Oscarsson, 2010).

Traditionally, in political studies, education was operationalized as the number of years of education (Converse, 1972; Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). Later on, the effect of this particular measure of number of years of education was disputed by several scholars (e.g., Condon, 2015; Nie, Junn, & Stehlik-Barry, 1996; Tenn, 2007). An additional year of education had little influence on political participation; only the educational environment itself, i.e., being a student, had a positive effect (Tenn, 2007). It is not likely that one year of additional education generates similar knowledge and skills within and across tracks of education (Persson, 2015). Years of education could also be a reflection of the family background, because higher educated persons (i.e., those with higher number of years of education) are more likely to have educated parents and live in ‘politicized environments’, where books and newspapers are more commonly read (Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980).

In reviewing the relation between formal years of education and participation in society, Hylligus (2005) distinguished three mechanisms. The first and oldest

mechanism is called the 'civic education mechanism': an additional year of education, where students develop civic skills and knowledge, facilitates more political and civic participation. The second mechanism is called the 'social network mechanism': the relative education attainment is decisive, "formal education sorts citizens into positions in the social and political hierarchy that facilitates political engagement to a greater or lesser degree" (Nie et al., 1996, p. 17). Those people in the central positions of social and political networks and hierarchies are asked to participate most often, and mobilization is a crucial part of becoming politically or civically active (Verba et al., 1995). The third mechanism is called the 'political meritocracy mechanism'. This mechanism suggests that the relationship between education and participation in society is spurious, because intelligence produces both (Hillygus, 2005). Put differently, the most intelligent students tend to stay in the educational system and also more actively participate in society.

In accordance with the third perspective notifying a spurious relationship, there have been quite a few studies that suggest that education works as a proxy for other factors (see Persson, 2015). For example, Berinsky and Lenz (2011, p. 367) conclude that "the kinds of people who get educated are the kinds of people who tend to participate in politics anyway". Education is a proxy for factors, such as socioeconomic status, the politicized family at home or the general cognitive level (Kam & Palmer, 2008). Accordingly, the link between education and participation is found in the home environment. The first discussions and experiences with politics usually take place within the family context (Quintelier, 2013). It is assumed that the base of political knowledge, attitudes and values is laid in early adolescence (e.g., Hooghe & Wilkenfeld, 2008). Socialization takes place through the transfer of political values and the political climate within the family, shaped by the political activities of parents and their socioeconomic status (Hooghe & Boonen, 2015; Jennings, Stoker, & Bowers, 2009). Especially parents with a higher socioeconomic status contribute to the development of political orientations, civic attitudes, and participation (Neundorff & Smets, 2017, Verba et al., 1995). The implication of this socialization process in the family context is that education as such makes little difference (Whiteley, 2005), as education is a proxy for socioeconomic status.

Yet, recent studies continue to underline the importance of education for participation in society, relying on dummy variables measuring 'high school graduation' (Milligan, Moretti, & Oreopoulos, 2004; Sondheimer & Green, 2010), 'college graduation' (Burden, 2009) or whether a person stayed in school beyond the minimum school leaving age (Denny & Doyle, 2008). What these measurements have

in common is that they do not account for the educational content and achievement within school (Condon, 2015). The content of the vocational and academic tracks, however, leads to different patterns of political and civic participation (Persson, 2015; van de Werfhorst, 2017). In pre-academic education, attention is paid to civic competences that are supposed to enhance political behavior, whereas in pre-vocational education the focus is more on social competences, such as self-confidence, self-respect, and elementary rules for social interaction (ten Dam & Volman, 2003; Leenders, Veugelers, & de Kat, 2008).

In summary, the impact of formal education seems to be through increased knowledge and skills. The knowledge and skills that are taught in schools will facilitate learning about politics and society, and therefore have an effect on students' future political and civic participation (Condon, 2015; Hillygus, 2005; Nie et al., 1996; Muller & Kogan, 2010). The acquired knowledge and skills in secondary school are generally assessed in final examinations. The Grade Point Average (GPA) predicts both political and civic participation (Metz & YOUNISS, 2005; Plutzer, 2002; Schmidt, Shumow, & Kackar, 2007). A number of other studies, addressing the predictive value of grades on individual subjects for political and civic behavior, report varying associations (e.g., Lauglo & Oia, 2006; Zaff et al., 2003). In the United States, higher standardized scores for reading and mathematics in 8th grade predicted only a two percent greater likelihood of civic participation (Zaff et al., 2003). But, the combination of reading and mathematical (SAT) scores (correlation of .65 in the study) does not seem to increase political participation (Hillygus, 2005). While reading and writing scores did matter for political participation, the math scores had a negative relationship with political participation (Hillygus, 2005).

The Current Study

The central aim of this study is to examine whether educational achievement at the end of secondary education/school directly predicts conventional and unconventional political participation and civic participation in early adulthood. In this study, we use the term political participation in its broadest sense to refer to all the "voluntary activities by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state" (van Deth, 2014, p. 354). This definition encompasses all activities that are targeted toward the area of politics, thus including not only traditional and conventional political activities such as voting and membership of political parties, but also more informal, online, and unconventional activities such as political consumption (e.g., buying Fairtrade products in response to the position of farmers

in developing countries) and signing petitions. Civic participation refers to “the participation of a citizen in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community’s future” (Adler & Goggin, 2005, p. 241). This encompasses activities such as volunteering, helping others or donating money to charity, and are not targeted at politics.

To examine the role of students’ educational achievement in young adults’ political and civic participation, we focus in this study on standardized grades in 11th and 12th grade of three core subjects in the Dutch central examination, which can be compared across schools. We control for the following background characteristics of students: socioeconomic status, religious background, and gender. If these background characteristics are not taken into account, the direct effects of education on participation could be misinterpreted, since these characteristics (a proxy for education) explain the relationship between education and participation in society to a certain degree (Hooghe, Dassonneville, & Marien, 2017; Persson, 2015). Also, to determine whether educational achievement is more influential than specific civic and citizenship education, the effects of educational achievement are controlled for two citizenship education outcome indicators, which are students’ civic knowledge and democratic attitudes in the 8th grade. These indicators are related to the civic competences that citizenship education is aiming to develop and both factors are correlated with future political and civic participation (Galston, 2001; Janmaat, 2001; Papanastasiou & Koutselini, 2003; Verba et al., 1995).

Method

Research Design

Data were collected in a two-wave study among Dutch adolescents and young adults. The data from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2009 were used for the first wave (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). In this study, 14-year-old students (grade 8) completed a civic knowledge test and questionnaire. The sampling method was a two-stage stratified cluster design (Schulz et al., 2010).¹⁴ The second wave of interviews among young adults took place in 2015 and 2016. For

14 The two stages of the sampling: first, approximately 150 secondary schools in each country were sampled using a probability proportional to school size. Second, from each selected school, one or two intact classes were sampled. In total 2,491 students in 85 schools in the Netherlands participated in the study.

this wave, 1,493 young adults were selected who participated in the 2009 ICCS study, and whose parental addresses were reachable by public transport within a time frame of 90 minutes. Various methods were used to get in contact with these young adults (see Figure 1 in Chapter 3). In general, it proved difficult to trace potential participants, as their current addresses were unknown.

First, 585 respondents were contacted through their Facebook pages. Second, a snowball method was used to get in touch with 46 former classmates of the responding young adults. Third, 90 old addresses of students were retrieved via their former secondary school. Unfortunately, most of these schools did not have this old administration available. Fourth, 271 new addresses were requested from the municipal administration files. Based on these four strategies, contact data of 992 young adults could be retrieved. It was not clear how many participants actually received our message. In total, 764 participants did not respond to our call.

A total of 178 contacted young adults agreed to participate in the study, whereas 50 young adults explicitly indicated that they were not willing to participate. Of the 178 young adults, a total of 134 young adults were actually interviewed. The other 44 young adults did not react to follow-up contacts to make an appointment, or cancelled the appointment made. An appointment was scheduled with an interviewer by e-mail or phone. The structured interviews took place at a convenient place for the respondent and were conducted by university confederates. The interviewers were trained in advance in order to ensure standardization of the interviewing. Using Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing, the instructions and questions for respondents were standardized. A regular interview took about 35 minutes.

The current study includes 111 respondents of the academic tracks (general secondary education and pre-university education).¹⁵ For each individual respondent, the ICCS 2009 survey responses were connected to the interview responses of the second wave using a unique coding key of the ICCS study. Nonresponse analysis, comparing the 111 participants with the remainder of participants in the academic tracks (1,423 respondents) of the ICCS sample, shows that there are no substantial differences in the distribution of gender ($\phi = -0.023$, $p = 0.378$) and religious background ($\phi = -0.041$, $p = 0.113$). However, participants in the study have a higher socioeconomic status (parental occupation $d = .42$ and parental education $d = .31$)

15 Pre-vocational students were not included in this chapter, as their central examination grades are not mutually comparable, due to the different levels within the pre-vocational track. The current sample does not allow all these different levels to be taken into account.

and slightly higher scores on political attitude and participation in the community in Grade 8 (political trust $d = .14$ and participation in the community $d = 0.24$).

Instruments

Dependent variables

In the second wave, the respondents were asked whether or not they participated in the preceding twelve months in 33 different political and six civic activities. For each political activity respondents indicated either *No, I did not participate over the past 12 months* (coded as 0), or *Yes, I participated over the past 12 months* (coded as 1). Using Mokken Scale analysis (MSA, Molenaar & Sijtsma, 2000) two measures of political participation were created, one indicating conventional and one indicating unconventional political participation (further details are described in the instrument construction of Chapter 2). The measure of civic participation included, among other things, volunteering and raising money for charity.

Conventional political participation. The final scale consisted of ten items.¹⁶ Item examples were: 'Contacted a political party', 'Wore or displayed a badge/sticker/T-shirt stating a political message' and 'Signed up for a political e-news bulletin'. The quality of the scales as a whole was assessed by the Loevingers Homogeneity Coefficient (H) (Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002). The general scale coefficient H value of 0.45 for conventional political participation pointed to a medium-strong cumulative scale. In Chapter 3, we reported the means for the individual items, as well as the H_i -coefficients. The H_i -coefficients reflected the fit of the items in the scale, and ranged from .38 to .56 indicating a good fit.

Unconventional political participation. The final scale consisted of ten items. Item examples were 'Took part in a public demonstration', 'Posted an article or video about politics' and 'Deliberately boycotted certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons'. The general scale coefficient $H = 0.46$ for unconventional political participation indicated a medium-strong cumulative scale. The H_i -coefficients ranged from .31 to .57, indicating an adequate fit.

Civic participation. The final index of civic participation is a combination of four activities (see Keeter et al., 2002b; Zukin et al., 2006). These civic activities are: 'Activities to raise money for charitable causes' (1 = yes, 0 = no); 'Doing volunteer work on a regular basis' (1 = at least once per week, 0 = less than once

16 Similar to chapters 3 and 4, based on 134 respondents.

per week); 'Active participation in a group or organization' (1 = participated or did voluntary work in any of eight different voluntary organizations, 0 = no affiliation, not a member of or have not donated money to any of eight different voluntary organizations); and 'Giving (informal) help to family members, neighbors or acquaintances' (1 = at least once per week, 0 = less than once per week).

Independent variables

Educational achievement. The educational achievement of students is based on records from the Education Executive Agency of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, and retrieved via Statistics Netherlands. The final examination grades of three mandatory core subjects were used: *Mathematics*, *English*, and *Dutch*. These final examination grades were comparable between schools due to centrally established standards. To take into account the different educational tracks and subjects of Mathematics, we created two dummy variables: 1) *Educational track*, which referred to the school track in which the respondents completed secondary education, distinguishing general secondary and pre-university tracks; 2) *Math subject*, coded: 0 for applied mathematics and statistics, and 1 for algebra and geometry. The Mathematics, English, and Dutch grades were not taken together as an average, but used separately as independent variables, to determine their unique contribution.

Background variables. *Socioeconomic status (SES)* was captured with three traditional indices (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.193): 1) The highest occupational status of one of the parents (HISEI), measured via the International Socio-Economic Index of occupational status, 2) the number of books at home, ranging from (0) 0-10 books to (5) more than 500, and 3) the highest educational level of one of the parents (HISCED), measured in the number of educational years. The resulting composite scores were converted to z-scores. *Religious affiliation* was measured via a question about the respondents' identification with a religion. Seven categories of religious affiliation were dichotomized as (0) not identifying with any religion, and (1) identifying with a religion (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2010, p. 107). *Gender* was coded with 0 for boys and 1 for girls.

Citizenship education indicators. *Civic knowledge* is measured in the ICCS 2009 study using a 79-item cognitive test (Schulz et al., 2010). The test was divided into two parts: 25 percent covered knowledge of citizenship, and 75 percent reasoning and analyzing civic and citizenship information. The final scale is derived using a Rasch model in the OPLM program (Verhelst, Glas, & Verstralen, 1993), and has a mean of 150 and a standard deviation of 10 (Schulz et al., 2011).

Democratic attitudes are measured in the ICCS 2009 study as the support for basic democratic values. The answers of five items ranged on a 4-point scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Item scores were recoded such that higher scores corresponded to more support. Two examples are: 'Everyone should always have the right to express their opinions freely'; and 'All citizens should have the right to elect their leaders freely' (Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011, p.171–174). The final scale has a Cronbach's alpha of .70.

Data Analysis

Prior to the analyses, we imputed missing values because of missing data on the educational achievement. Analysis of only the 'complete cases' might have resulted in a loss of information, and estimation bias ('item nonresponse error') (de Leeuw & Hox, 2008). Data were assumed to be Missing At Random (MAR); the reason for an item being missing was not seen as depending on the outcome of the item in question. The educational achievement information was missing when the identification of a person failed due to the lack of unique address data, not because of a person's low achievement score. It may be that data were missing because the student had not taken a final exam, although this appears to be rare on the basis of the self-report of the educational level. The imputations under MAR provided unbiased parameter estimates and prevented the loss of statistical power (Graham, 2009). We used the Multiple Imputation procedure in SPSS with 20 imputed datasets, in accordance with the fraction of missing information (Bodner, 2008). Auxiliary variables used in the imputation procedure were extracted from the first wave, the ICCS 2009 data collection. Following Collins, Schafer, and Kam (2001) we included all possibly relevant auxiliary variables that were correlated ($r \geq .15$) with the variables with missing cases (see Appendix C for the multiple imputation step-by-step). The imputations procedure on 111 respondents recognized 85 respondents with complete data on all variables and 26 respondents with incomplete data. Both data files were used in the main analysis to identify any differences.

In the results section, the descriptive statistics and bivariate associations between variables are presented (see Table 1). Then, a multiple multivariate regression analysis using a Maximum Likelihood estimator in MPlus version 7.31 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) was performed to assess the predictive value of academic achievement on political participation and civic participation. Beforehand, we checked for multilevel structure of the data. There was zero intra-class correlation in conventional political participation and civic participation, and .04 in unconventional political participation,

and therefore single level models were considered appropriate. The analyses were performed on both the imputed data and the complete cases data, to check for notable differences in output. For all models, the standardized coefficients were reported.

The multiple multivariate analysis consisted of four main steps. In the first model (Model 1), three variables measuring students' background characteristics and socialization (gender, socioeconomic status and religious affiliation) were tested for their association with conventional political, unconventional political and civic participation. These three dependent variables were allowed to correlate. Correlations among dependent variables were included in the tables.

The following two models were different extensions to Model 1. To control for the influence of specific civic competences, two covariates, *Civic knowledge* and *Democratic attitudes*, were added in Model 2, as in Chapter 3 we showed that these covariates were associated with the dependent variables. To ascertain the contribution of educational achievement, Model 3 tested the associations between the educational achievement (final examination grades) of the students, together with the variables *Educational track* and *Math subject*, and conventional political, unconventional political and civic participation. The coefficients of the predictor variables were freely estimated for each of the dependent variables. Again, the three dependent variables were allowed to correlate. In addition, an extension of Model 3 with interactions between the final examination grades and educational track was performed (see Table D1 in Appendix D). In the final model (Model 4), all factors were added, resulting in a complete model.

Results

Table 1 shows descriptive information on the dependent, independent and control variables in our study. The dependent variable *Conventional political participation* had a mean value of 1.74 and a standard deviation of 1.94. This means that young adults participate in only a few conventional political activities, but they vary considerably in the number of activities. The dependent variable *Unconventional political participation* had a mean value of 3.17 and a standard deviation of 2.27. In general, young adults in the current sample participated more in unconventional political activities than in conventional activities: $t(110) = -7.40$, $p < 0.001$. On average, young adults participated in at least one (mean of 1.19, standard deviation of 1.13) of the four civic activities. Thirty-two percent of the young adults did not participate in any civic activity. The means of several attitudes and values were high, indicating that most respondents adhered to basic democratic values and attitudes.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations of all the Variables used in the Analysis^a

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Mean	SD
1. Conventional pol. participation	-												1.74	1.94
2. Unconventional pol. participation	.56**	-											3.16	2.27
3. Civic participation	.23*	.33**	-										1.19	1.13
4. Dutch	.00	.11	.00	-									65.07	10.41
5. English	.04	.06	-.17	.40**	-								67.14	10.73
6. Math	.14	.03	.21*	.27*	.17	-							68.80	13.19
7. Civic knowledge	.19*	.18	-.04	.23*	.43**	.16	-						159.28	8.65
8. Dem. attitudes	-.06	.18	-.00	.03	.26*	.02	.13	-					3.35	0.41
9. SES	.12	.23*	-.07	.02	.38**	.11	.25*	.39**	-				0.09	1
10. Gender	-.16	.14	.25**	.11	-.22*	.02	.08	-.06	-.07	-			51.4% male	
11. Religious affiliation	.20*	.03	.18	-.10	-.12	.03	-.08	-.19	-.19	-.03	-		42.3% yes	
12. Educational track	.12	.14	.03	.16	.27*	.10	.20*	.44**	.33*	-.02	-.15	-	67.6% pre-university	
13. Math subject	-.08	-.03	.02	.20	.10	.12	-.05	.09	-.02	-.04	.02	.16	-	41% algebra/geometry

Note.

^a Based on 111 respondents.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 1 also shows the correlations among the variables. Concerning the independent variables, adolescents who had higher grades in English language also had higher grades in Dutch language, $r(111) = .40, p < .001$, higher scores on civic knowledge, $r(111) = .43, p < .001$, and had a higher socioeconomic status, $r(111) = .38, p < .001$. Aside from that, adolescents who had a higher SES scored higher on support for democratic attitudes, $r(111) = .39, p < .001$ and were in a higher educational track, $r(111) = .44, p < .001$. Multicollinearity was not considered a threat in this case, as the correlations between independent variables are all well below .50.

The correlations among the dependent variables revealed positive relationships. Conventional political participation had a positive relation with unconventional political participation, $r(111) = .56, p < .001$ and civic participation, $r(111) = .23, p = .01$. Unconventional political participation had a moderate positive association with civic participation, $r(111) = .33, p < .001$.

In the first model (see Table 2), the background characteristics were included as predictors of our dependent variables. The test for Model 1, $\chi^2(9) = 39.56, p < .001$, indicated that the fit of the model is statistically significantly better than the empty model. The model explained 12 percent of the variance in conventional political participation, 8 percent in unconventional political participation and 10 percent in civic participation. Students with a religious background participated more in civic ($\beta = .19, p = .03$) and conventional political activities ($\beta = .28, p = .002$) as young adults than non-religious students. A higher SES was associated with more conventional ($\beta = .19, p = .02$) and unconventional political participation ($\beta = .26, p = .003$). Gender contributed significantly to the model of civic participation ($\beta = .26, p = .006$), with young women participating more in civic activities than young men.

In Model 2, two covariates of civic competences were added to Model 1. The statistic of $\Delta\chi^2(6) = 12.83, p = .046$, indicates that Model 2 fitted significantly better than Model 1. The test for the overall model, $\chi^2(15) = 27.63, p < .001$, was also statistically significant. Model 2 explained 17 percent of the variance in conventional political participation, 12 percent of unconventional political participation, and 10 percent of civic participation. As for Model 1, gender ($\beta = .26, p = .005$), and religious affiliation ($\beta = .19, p = .03$), were statistically significant predictors of civic participation. Religious affiliation ($\beta = .30, p = .002$) and civic knowledge ($\beta = .21, p = .03$) were associated with conventional political participation in young adulthood. So, the more civic knowledge students have, the more they participate in conventional political activities in early adulthood.

Table 2
Multivariate Regression Analysis of Political Participation and Civic Participation on Educational Achievement

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Conv. participation	Unconv. participation	Civic participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic.	Cov.	Unconv.	Civic.
<i>Intercept</i>	-.12 (.15)	-.25 (.15)	-.41 (.15)	-3.06(1.95)	-3.69 (1.92)	-.97 (1.99)	-.76 (.78)	-.62 (.80)	-.47 (.80)	-2.92 (2.00)	-3.76 (2.06)	-1.23 (2.04)
Gender	-.14 (.09)	.16† (.09)	.26** (.09)	-.14 (.09)	.17† (.09)	.26** (.09)	-.16† (.09)	.14 (.10)	.23* (.09)	-.17† (.09)	.14 (.10)	.23* (.09)
SES	.19* (.09)	.26** (.09)	-.00 (.10)	.15 (.10)	.18† (.10)	-.02 (.11)	.15 (.10)	.25* (.10)	-.01 (.11)	.13 (.10)	.20† (.11)	-.02 (.11)
Religious affiliation	.28** (.09)	.08 (.09)	.19* (.09)	.30** (.09)	.10 (.09)	.19* (.09)	.30** (.09)	.10 (.09)	.18* (.09)	.31** (.09)	.11 (.09)	.19* (.09)
Civic knowledge				.21* (.10)	.12 (.10)	.01 (.10)				.19† (.11)	.13 (.11)	.02 (.11)
Democratic attitudes				-.11 (.09)	.14 (.09)	.04 (.10)				-.12 (.10)	.16 (.10)	.06 (.10)
Dutch							.02 (.12)	.11 (.12)	-.07 (.11)	-.00 (.12)	.12 (.12)	-.07 (.11)
English							-.07 (.13)	-.04 (.13)	-.14 (.12)	-.08 (.14)	-.11 (.13)	-.16 (.13)
Math							.15 (.10)	-.02 (.11)	.24* (.10)	.10 (.10)	-.03 (.11)	.24* (.10)
Math subject							-.08 (.10)	-.03 (.11)	.01 (.10)	-.10 (.10)	-.02 (.11)	.01 (.10)
Educational track							.15 (.10)	.08 (.10)	.09 (.10)	.11 (.10)	.02 (.11)	.08 (.10)
Partial correlation												
Conv. partic.	1			1			1			1		
Unconv. partic.	.50	1		.49	1		.48	1		.48	1	
Civic partic.	.25	.29	1	.25	.28	1	.22	.29	1	.22	.28	1
Model fit												
R ²	.12	.8	.10	.17	.12	.10	.18	.10	.17	.22	.14	.18
χ ² (df) ^a	39.56** (9)			52.02** (15)			46.75** (24)			58.56** (30)		

Note. Standardized coefficients Beta (SE) are reported, based on 111 respondents.

Conv = conventional political participation; Unconv = unconventional political participation; Civic = civic participation.
^a χ² of entire model and additions to model.

† $p < .1$, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

To determine the contribution of educational achievement on participation in the society, in Model 3 we tested the educational achievement without the covariates of civic competences. Comparing this model with Model 1, the statistic of $\Delta\chi^2(15) = 12.15, p = .668$, indicated that the model fit did not increase with the inclusion of the educational achievement predictors. The overall model, $\chi^2(24) = 46.75, p = .004$, was still statistically significant (compared to the empty model). The model explained 18 and 10 percent of the variance in conventional and unconventional political participation, respectively, and 17 percent of the variance in civic participation. Concerning the individual contribution of educational achievement variables, the math grade ($\beta = .24, p = .02$) was a statistically significant predictor of civic participation. Thus, adolescents with a higher math grade participate more in civic activities as young adults.¹⁷

In the last step, the covariates (civic competences) were added, resulting in the final Model 4. The overall model test, $\chi^2(30) = 58.56, p = .001$, is statistically significant, but a model comparison, $\Delta\chi^2(15) = 11.61, p = .708$, indicated that the model did not fit better than Model 2. This also applied to the comparison of Model 4 with Model 3, $\chi^2(6) = 9.86, p = .001$. The final model explains 22 and 14 percent of the variance in conventional and unconventional political participation, respectively, and 18 percent of the variance in civic participation. The math grade was still a statistically significant predictor of civic political participation ($\beta = .24, p = .02$). The contribution of civic knowledge ($\beta = .19, p = .08$) to conventional political participation slightly diminished, rendering the predictor statistically non-significant.

To check the robustness of the multiple imputations regarding the four models, we conducted a complete cases analysis (see Table D2 in Appendix D). The results of the complete cases analysis were largely the same as the multivariate regression analysis with multiple imputation.¹⁸ Concerning the contribution of the covariates of civic competences, democratic attitudes were a statistically significant predictor for unconventional political participation ($\beta = .22, p = .02$) in the final model, meaning that adolescents with higher scores on the democratic

17 An extra model with interaction variables between grades and educational track was tested. No statistically significant interaction effects were found (see appendix D1).

18 An extra model with interaction variables between grades and educational track showed a positive interaction between math grade and educational track, suggesting that students in the pre-university track with higher math grades participate more in conventional political activities than their fellow students in the general secondary track (see appendix D3).

attitude scale participated more in unconventional political activities. The positive association between civic knowledge and conventional political participation diminished. The influence of educational achievement on political participation was still largely absent, controlling for background characteristics and civic competences. The only difference noticed was a relationship between math grade and conventional political participation ($\beta = .20, p = .04$) in Model 3, when the covariates of civic competences were not yet included in the model.

Conclusion and Discussion

The current study assessed the long-term associations of students' educational achievement during secondary school with conventional and unconventional political and civic participation in young adulthood. Using a diverse set of educational achievement indicators, the findings highlight different associations between citizenship education outcome indicators, educational achievement in compulsory subjects, and civic and political participation in young adulthood. Empirical evidence is provided that adolescents with higher final examination grades in the subject of mathematics participate more frequently in civic activities in young adulthood, after controlling for other background characteristics and citizenship education indicators. In contrast, the relationship between educational achievement and political participation is absent. Civic knowledge, an indicator of citizenship education outcomes, was stronger related to political participation in young adulthood. Assuming that school contributes to students' civic knowledge, school seems to be able to play a role in activating political participation. For civic participation, school's contribution is more diffuse. As the citizenship education outcomes explained no variance in civic participation, it may indicate that for 14-year-old adolescents a civic knowledge base and democratic attitudes are not sufficient to take part in civic activities as 21-year-old adults, but it does work for certain forms of political participation. In short, specific civic competences and educational achievement, especially math performance, have a different association with political and civic participation. They seem to function independently of each other, which makes them both interesting to encourage when it comes to later participation in society.

One result in particular caught our attention: the fact that students' math performance seemed to be a predictor for civic participation. The relationship between math performance and civic participation that we found is not self-evident.

Examination grades measure student performance to a large extent, but the grades may also be affected by a motivational component. Hillygus (2005) suggested that the motivation to excel in school may likewise motivate an individual to participate in society as a citizen although she did not find a relationship between cumulative GPA and future political participation in her own study. An indication that student general educational achievement (not only mathematics) and motivation can lead to civic participation was given in a panel study in the United States, indicating that secondary school students (aged 16 to 18) who were willing to volunteer were significantly more likely to be female, religious and performing better at school (Metz & Youniss, 2005). An additional explanation may be the fact that students with higher grades in mathematics choose studies in higher education which provide more opportunities (e.g. in terms of free time available) to deliver community help, or that these are the more able students, and thereby have more free time to engage in civic activities because they have to put less effort in their studies—seeing that some forms of civic participation (volunteering or informal help) depend on a certain amount of free time a person has (e.g., Putnam, 2000). These explanations, however, are highly speculative, and our finding could as well be attributed to a confounding factor, such as recruitment (being asked to participate; Jacobsen & Casalaspi, 2016), as these young adults might have been put more often in a position in which an appeal for aid is made. Finally, the interesting thing about performance in mathematics is that, as a school subject, it is probably the least related to socio-economic status and the civic competences in our study, as the small bivariate associations show. As a result, the contribution of mathematics performance to participation in society, certainly in comparison with the performance in English, might not be confounded by the covariance with SES and the civic competences.

Furthermore, we noticed that the educational track of the student had no association with participation in society in young adulthood. This finding contradicts previous research, which considered educational attainment to be relevant (e.g., Milligan et al., 2004; Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger & Rosenstone, 1980). We note that in our study only the two highest academic tracks have been included. In the vocational track, the subjects and associated performance are much more diverse. Future studies, including vocational tracks, may show in more detail whether attainment is relevant for participation in the society.

Strengths and Limitations

In our study we measured educational achievement and educational attainment, and their associations with participation in society. Previous studies focused primarily on educational attainment (e.g., years of education or high school graduation), but educational attainment does not reveal what people actually learn (Campbell, 2006). Therefore, we relied on more detailed measures, next to education attainment (track), and including both specific citizenship education outcome indicators, and three general educational achievement indicators.

The different associations we found of citizenship education indicators and educational achievement indicators, in relation to the dependent variables, indicate that our choice of multivariate models is recommended in this context, as it allowed simultaneous testing of the predictors across the different outcomes. Besides, the direction of the associations between individual background variables and political and civic participation is closely related to earlier research (Henn & Foard, 2013; Marien, Hooghe & Quintelier, 2010; Schmeets & te Riele, 2013; Verba et al., 1995).

Still, a few shortcomings might have had an influence on the conclusions of this study. For instance, the relatively small sample size is a point of concern. Models with more than ten predictors may have suffered from a lack of power to detect statistically significant relations. Therefore we did not include the four interaction variables (English, Dutch and Math grade multiplied by educational track, and Math subject multiplied by track) in our main analyses. In an extra analysis, the inclusion of interaction variables did not lead to an improvement in explaining participation in society. The concern of power of these analyses can be addressed with a larger sample. However, this will not be achieved without a struggle. Tracking an adolescent after leaving secondary school turned out to be more difficult than expected in advance. A future large-scale study, with sufficient resources, will then point out whether the association between math achievement at the end of secondary education and civic participation as a young adult is still present when the interactions with educational track are taken into consideration.

Moreover, the data collection methods of wave one and two were different. A paper-and-pencil survey, as applied in the first wave, was not deemed suitable to motivate the young adults to participate in wave two of the study. Therefore, in wave two respondents were asked to participate in a face-to-face interview to address them personally. Also, to reduce the possibility of haphazardly filling in answers, the interviewer in wave 2 could monitor the actions and intentions of the participants.

In the final sample, the respondents scored relatively high on SES compared to the total sample of young adults who participated in ICCS, as only the two highest of the three educational tracks in the Netherlands were included. As a result, an overestimation of the amount of political and civic participation is plausible, as SES and political and civic participation are positively related (Putnam, 2000; Verba et al., 1995). As far as estimating the relationship between educational achievement and political and civic participation is concerned, this could imply that the observed mechanisms only hold for young adults who are relatively interested in political and social issues. Further studies are needed to examine whether the observed relationships are representative of other young adults as well.

We operationalized educational achievement in terms of final examination grades, and used data from Statistics Netherlands, which led to 14 to 18 percent of missing data for our participants, which could not be found in the system due to a combination of non-unique personal data and incorrectly transmitted postal codes or addresses, or drop-out from secondary school. We used multiple imputation to include these participants in the data analysis. There was no empirical evidence that a complete cases analysis differed from the analyses based on the multiple imputed data set.

Finally, the citizenship education (in 8th grade) and general educational achievement indicators (at the end of secondary school, 11th and 12th grade) were measured at different moments in the students' school career. As we stated earlier, the students in our study had not received formal citizenship education in the 8th grade. Until recently, citizenship education in the Netherlands was concentrated in upper secondary education, including a 40-hour requirement of service learning. Previous research showed that students might benefit from such a requirement of voluntary activity, since their volunteering in secondary school was associated with future political and civic participation (Kahne, Crow & Lee, 2013; Metz & Youniss, 2005). Future research on political and civic participation of young adults can provide more insight into the interplay between received citizenship education, i.e., service learning in upper secondary education and educational achievement in general subjects. Including mock elections, school debates and other citizenship education activities from upper secondary education in future research determines the value of these initiatives for political and civic participation. In addition, measuring educational achievement both in separate subjects and averaged across subjects may show whether specific subjects contribute to certain forms of political or civic participation (e.g., Paterson, 2009), or whether educational achievement in general stimulates participation in society.

6

Summary and General Discussion

Introduction

Over the past two decades, many Western countries have been engaged in policies to enhance citizenship among students in primary and secondary education (Eurydice, 2017). In the Netherlands, a law was enacted in 2006 which requires schools to actively promote students' citizenship and social integration. The underlying assumption is that students learn about the democratic constitutional state and practice democracy inside and outside the classroom, thus acquiring key civic and citizenship competences which enable them and make them willing to participate in society as adults. Civic and citizenship competences are herein conceived as a combination of civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to become active citizens (Hoskins et al., 2008). This dissertation aimed to discern to what extent civic competences of students in lower secondary school actually predict their participation in society as young adults, and to what extent other factors, like the stimulation from parents and peers or their general cognitive level, might offer alternative explanations for their societal participation. This together provides an overview of the extent to which these two factors might offer alternative explanations for young adults' participation in society.

Societal participation is conceptualized using two main dimensions: political participation and civic participation. Political participation, following Van Deth (2014), is defined as a "voluntary activity by citizens in the area of government, politics or the state" (p. 354). Political participation encompasses two subtypes: conventional and unconventional (e.g., Barrett & Zani, 2015). The first form, conventional political participation, falls within the scope of the electoral process and representative democracy, and involves activities like voting, contacting politicians and campaigning for a political party. The second type, unconventional political participation, is located outside the electoral process and institutions of representative democracy, encompassing activities like signing petitions, demonstrating, and boycotting certain products or events (cf. Linssen et al., 2018; Pachi & Barrett, 2012; van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009). Civic participation, on the other hand, is not guided by political ideas or interests. Following Adler and Goggin (2005), it is conceived as "the participation of a citizen in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community's future" (p. 241). Civic participation comprises activities like volunteering, helping others and donating money to charity (e.g., Zukin et al., 2006).

To measure political and civic participation among young adults, an index for civic participation and scales for conventional and unconventional political participation were developed as part of this dissertation (Chapter 2). Particularly for assessing political participation among young adults, a new questionnaire was developed, the Political Activities of Young Adults (PAYA) inventory, which addresses both conventional and unconventional forms of participation. The inventory captures offline and online political activities that young people are engaged in, and is directed specifically to young adults (18 to 24 years old).

In order to determine to what extent students' civic competences, socialization experiences, and their general cognitive level predict their participation as young adults in society, a longitudinal panel study was conducted. With a time span of approximately seven years, young adults who took part as 14 year olds in the 2009 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) in the Netherlands (Schulz et al., 2010) were interviewed again in 2015 and 2016. In the ICCS 2009 study, 2,491 Dutch Grade 8 students completed a civic knowledge test and a questionnaire on their engagement in civic and citizenship activities in and outside school, and their political attitudes and values. A total of 134 respondents took part in the follow-up interview seven years later.

The first aim of this dissertation was *to study the extent to which civic competences of adolescents predict their political and civic participation as young adults*. In Chapter 3 we examined whether students' civic knowledge, their support for basic democratic values, their political efficacy, their attitudes toward engaged and duty-based citizenship, and their participation in extracurricular civic activities inside and outside school affected their political and civic participation in young adulthood. Civic knowledge, support for democratic values and political efficacy were previously found to be associated with future political participation, but it is not yet known if these civic competences lead to actual participation in society as a young adult (Bengtsson & Christensen, 2014; Cho & McLeod, 2007; Galston, 2001; Verba et al, 1995). Duty-based and engaged citizenship attitudes seem to be important for different measures of political participation (Dalton, 2008), whereas students' participation in extracurricular civic activities are related to both political and civic participation in young adulthood (Dassonneville et al., 2012; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Keating & Janmaat, 2015).

The second aim of this dissertation was *to assess the extent to which adolescents' political socialization from discussions with parents and friends, media use and their involvement in voluntary associations predict their political and civic participation as*

young adults. Whereas the study on civic competences was primarily directed toward the influence of schooling, it can be argued that other socialization experiences might provide adolescents with the knowledge, interest, trust, and network (sources of social capital) that enable them to become active citizens. Students' socialization experiences are examined as the first alternative explanation for young adults' participation in society. For example, political discussions within the family play an important role in the development of civic attitudes, knowledge, and political activities of adolescents (e.g., Andolina et al., 2003; Jennings et al., 2009; McDevitt & Kioussis, 2007). Also, early involvement in voluntary associations leads to more societal participation in young adulthood (McFarland & Thomas, 2006). In late adolescence, political discussion among peers and access to media is related to more societal participation (Ekström & Östman, 2013; Wanders, 2019).

The third aim of this dissertation was *to determine the extent to which general academic performance predicts political and civic participation of young adults*. Next to their socialization experiences, the effect of students' general academic achievement on political and civic participation as young adults is examined as a second alternative explanation. The underlying assumption is that, rather than through specific civic and citizenship competences, young adults' participation in political and civic activities is incited by their general ability to understand political and social processes, their ability to voice their concerns, and their ability to create support for and to initiate solutions (cf. Campbell, 2006). Moreover, better educated people tend to get more influential positions in society and social networks, and therefore will be more encouraged to participate in society (see Nie et al., 1996; Verba et al., 1995).

In the next sections, the results of the four empirical chapters will be summarized and reflected upon, overall conclusions will be presented with notes on the limitations and strengths, and implications and recommendations for practice and further research will be given.

Summary of Findings

In Chapter 2 the following research objective was addressed: *the development of an instrument for measuring political participation among young adults that meets the psychometric requirements of scalability, reliability, and validity*. A literature review revealed that existing instruments on political participation only partly addressed unconventional political participation of young adults, did not adequately account for online forms of political participation, captured only a few political activities, or were not directed toward young adults (18 and 24 year olds). Therefore, a new

instrument to map both conventional and unconventional political participation, the *Political Activities of Young Adults* (PAYA) inventory, was developed. The PAYA inventory is based on items from existing instruments (Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011; Howard et al., 2007; Keeter et al., 2002b; Thomassen, 2001), to which a number of online activism items, like blogging, signing e-petitions, and online protests, have been added (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Barrett & Brunton-Smith, 2014; Oser et al., 2012; Quintelier & Theocharis, 2013).

As some political activities are more demanding in terms of effort and allegiance than others, these are less likely for young adults to be engaged in. To reflect these differences in popularity of activities in political participation, Mokken Scale Analysis (MSA; Mokken & Lewis, 1982; Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002) was used to construct scales of political participation. An initial 38-item version of the questionnaire was piloted with 177 Dutch young adults aged 17 to 25 years old. A first item selection procedure with MSA resulted in multiple fragmented subtypes of political participation which were difficult to interpret. Moreover, in the MSA a few core items of political participation, such as taking part in a demonstration, were excluded. Therefore, MSA was subsequently performed on two predetermined subtypes of political participation: conventional and unconventional political participation. The analysis on each of the two subtypes of political participation resulted in two coherent scales with 9 items for conventional political participation (e.g., member of a political party; followed a politician or party online), and 10 items for unconventional political participation (e.g., taken part in a public demonstration; posted an article or video about politics online).

Convergent validity of the PAYA inventory was supported by strong positive relationships of political interest with both conventional and unconventional political participation. Political trust and social trust proved to be moderately correlated to conventional participation, and weakly correlated to unconventional participation. Media use on politics was moderately correlated with both conventional and unconventional political participation. All together, these results reflect the findings from previous studies into political participation (e.g., Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Quintelier, 2013; van Stekelenburg et al., 2016; Verba et al., 1995). The PAYA inventory was then used to measure conventional and unconventional participation in the studies described in Chapters 3 to 5.

Chapter 3 addressed the research question: *To what extent is the political and civic participation of young adults predicted by their civic and citizenship competences as adolescents?* Civic and citizenship competences were measured in the 2009

International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) by means of 14-year-old students' civic knowledge, their support of basic democratic values (i.e., the right of all citizens to express their opinions and to elect their leaders freely), attitudes toward engaged and duty-based citizenship (i.e., expectations about the role of citizens in politics and society), political efficacy, and participation in extracurricular civic activities inside and outside school. Political and civic participation was measured seven years later in a follow-up interview with 134 young adults.

Multivariate multiple regression analysis revealed a positive relationship between civic knowledge and conventional and unconventional political participation, controlling for the effect of students' socioeconomic status, religious affiliation and gender. Support for democratic values was positively related to unconventional political participation but not to conventional political participation. The way these democratic values are operationalized, referring to 'protest behavior' and 'the right to express their opinions freely', resembles our conception of unconventional political participation to some extent. Attitudes of adolescents toward duty-based and engaged citizenship did not make a difference for either their political or civic participation at a later age. Although engaged citizenship (reflecting support for peaceful protests against laws believed to be unjust) seems to echo reasons for participating in unconventional political activities, as does duty-based citizenship (reflecting intentions to vote in elections, and to show respect for government representatives) for conventional political participation, these relationships were not corroborated in our study. Moreover, adolescents who were politically efficacious (i.e., confident in being able to participate in politics) and were participating in community and school activities did not participate more frequently in political and civic activities as young adults than adolescents who were less politically efficacious and less active during their school career.

The most striking result of this study is that civic knowledge is indeed found to affect both conventional and unconventional forms of political participation. However, we might have found an indirect effect of education instead of civic knowledge, as education increases knowledge, affects political interest and efficacy, and in the end triggers political participation (Persson, 2015). At the same time, the role of educational attainment is blurred, because it could be either an indirect cause of political participation (education develops civic competences and increases political interest) or it serves as a proxy for other factors, such as the family socioeconomic status, socialization experiences, personality type or cognitive level (Kam & Palmer, 2008; Persson, 2015). Differences in young adults' political participation might thus

be related to different forms of political socialization, not just in schools but also in other socialization experiences they encounter during their adolescence, in the context of their family and friends, voluntary associations and the use of media (e.g., Campbell, 2009).

In Chapter 4, the following research question was addressed: *To what extent is the political participation of young adults predicted by their socialization experiences during adolescence?* To determine relevant socialization experiences in their family and peer network, the frequency of talking with parents and friends about political and social issues during adolescence was examined. Socialization experiences through media and voluntary associations were measured by means of students' use of media to obtain information on social and political issues as 14 year olds, and their self-reported involvement in voluntary associations as adolescents.

Based on the longitudinal panel design with data derived from the Dutch subsample in ICCS 2009, and the follow-up study in 2015 and 2016 on 134 young adults, the effect of socialization experiences on conventional and unconventional political participation was explored using multivariate multiple regression analysis, controlling for effects of relevant student background, including educational attainment and students' perceptions of openness in classroom discussions. The analyses revealed no significant relationships between the previously described socialization experiences in adolescence and political participation of young adults seven years later. Findings from previous studies, indicating that political discussions with parents and friends, involvement in voluntary associations, as well as media use for political information affected the political participation of adolescents and young adults, were therefore not corroborated in this study (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011, Ekström & Östman, 2013; Leyva, 2017; Neundorf et al., 2016; Quintelier, 2013).

With respect to discussing politics with friends in early adolescence, however, a moderation effect with educational level was found for conventional political participation. Students in the pre-vocational education track who discussed political and social issues with friends were less involved in conventional political activities as young adults than students from the pre-university track discussing politics with friends. This may indicate that other mechanisms are at play for pre-vocational and pre-university students. A possible explanation might be that pre-vocational students more often talk negatively about politics with their friends, which prohibits them from becoming political active in adulthood. In this case

they will not perceive social support from friends to participate, and are less likely to engage in conventional political activities (Glasford, 2008).

Chapter 5 addressed the research question: *To what extent is the political and civic participation of young adults predicted by their academic achievement in secondary school?* The study assessed the relationship between adolescents' final examination grades in three core compulsory subjects and their conventional and unconventional political and civic participation in young adulthood. Data from 111 Dutch adolescents in the academic tracks (higher general secondary education and pre-university education)¹⁹, who participated in the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) in 2009 (14-year-old students), and a follow-up a subsample in 2015 and 2016 (21 year olds), were used. This study included data from Statistics Netherlands on students' educational achievements (i.e., national examination scores in three mandatory core subjects: Mathematics, English, and Dutch language) to assess their relationship with participation in society in a multivariate multiple regression analysis.

The results revealed that, after controlling for effects of relevant student background characteristics and civic competences, higher achieving students in any of these three subjects did not differ from lower achieving students with regard to both conventional and unconventional political participation a few years later. The study also indicated no significant relationship between students' achievement in English and Dutch language in late adolescence (17 and 18 year olds), and civic participation in young adulthood, though students with higher achievement in mathematics were more inclined toward civic participation as young adults. This may suggest that students with higher grades in mathematics are the more able students, meaning they have to put less effort into their studies and thus have more time to engage in civic activities.

Conclusions and Discussion

This dissertation aimed to examine whether acquired civic and citizenship competences at school enhance students' political and civic participation in later life. Do civic competences of students in lower secondary school actually predict their participation in society as young adults? To what extent do other factors, like adolescents' socialization experiences or their general level of academic

19 Pre-vocational students were not included in this study, as their central examination grades are not mutually comparable, due to the different levels within the pre-vocational track. The sample did not allow all these different levels to be taken into account.

performance, offer alternative—and possibly even more compelling—explanations for young adults' participation in society?

The predictive value of citizenship competences and socialization experiences on political participation

This study reveals that civic knowledge of adolescents predicts both their conventional and unconventional political participation in young adulthood (Chapter 3). This finding suggests that schools may contribute to citizens' participation in society by promoting civic knowledge, as part of civic and citizenship education, assuming that schools influence the development of civic competences. Previous research indicates that schools can promote students' civic knowledge through particularly the school curriculum and to a lesser extent the pedagogical climate (Geboers et al., 2013).

In this dissertation, no relation was found between young adolescents' attitudes toward engaged and duty-based citizenship, their political efficacy, participation in extracurricular activities at school, the presence of socialization experiences at home and in the wider community on the one hand, and participation in society as a young adult on the other. The lack of evidence regarding the association between adolescents' political attitudes, socialization experiences (Chapter 4) and their participation in society as young adults might be due to the low prevalence and lack of stability of political attitudes at the age of fourteen (e.g., Niemi & Hepburn, 1995) in combination with the large time lag between measurements in the panel study. Scholars have suggested that people will get stable attitudes or beliefs when they are concerned about or familiar with political issues (Converse, 1964; Sears & Levy, 2003). Attitudes and beliefs regarding the political playing field of 14-year-old adolescents are unlikely to have been crystalized yet. Political attitudes and orientations of young people tend to become more stable toward young adulthood (Sears & Brown, 2013). Assessing political attitudes at a later age might have provided different outcomes, as especially in middle and late adolescence (aged 15 to 18, also referred to as 'the impressionable years') people are most susceptible to political influences (Eckstein et al., 2012; Sears & Brown, 2013). In this dissertation, we find less evidence of an association of civic competences and features of socialization at the age of 14 with political and civic participation (e.g., Hooghe & Wilkenfeld, 2008) compared to studies on political attitudes in later adolescence, when political awareness and interest is more developed (Neundorff et al., 2013; Wittebrood, 1995). Studies based on smaller

time frames and older adolescents do find positive effects of participation in school projects and extracurricular activities among late adolescents with successive measurements within two years (Keating & Janmaat, 2016; Zaff et al., 2003).

General academic performance as an alternative explanation for the political and civic participation of young adults

The dissertation further explored the extent to which the political and civic participation of young adults is related to their general cognitive level (Chapter 5), on top of indicators of socialization and civic competences that were found to be significantly related to political and civic participation in the previous chapters. The study did not provide convincing evidence that young adults' participation in political and civic activities is incited by their academic performances at the end of high school. However, students from different tracks differ with regard to their political participation—although these differences were mainly found between the pre-vocational track and the pre-university track (Chapter 4), and not between the higher general secondary education track and pre-university track (Chapter 5). These findings corroborate the conclusions of previous studies that students in the academic tracks are generally more inclined to participate in political activities than those in pre-vocational tracks (Janmaat et al, 2014; Netjes, van de Werfhorst, Dijkstra, & Geboers, 2011; Quintelier, 2010), especially in educational systems with early tracking, such as in the Netherlands (van de Werfhorst, 2017). Although mechanisms explaining these differences have barely been studied to date, earlier studies suggest that in pre-vocational education less attention is paid to civic competences that are supposed to enhance political behavior, while pre-vocational education is more focused on social competences, such as self-confidence, self-respect, and elementary rules for social interaction (ten Dam & Volman, 2003; Leenders, Veugelers, & de Kat, 2008).

Strengths, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The empirical studies presented in Chapters 2 to 5 have a number of strengths and limitations, which were discussed at the end of each of these chapters. This section addresses some general strengths and limitations of this dissertation, with regard to the study design, sample size and the measurement of main constructs, and concludes with recommendations for further research.

First, our studies provide one of the few attempts to research what contributes to the political and civic participation in adulthood from a longitudinal perspective. As

cross-sectional studies and longitudinal studies with a timespan of two or three years found positive associations between civic competences and civic outcomes (e.g., Cohen & Chaffee, 2012; Manganelli et al., 2014; Pasek et al., 2008; Quintelier & Hooghe, 2011), it was not clear whether these associations persist in the long term, implying that civic knowledge and orientations in early adolescence predict political and civic activities in young adulthood (e.g., Krampen, 1999). This dissertation adds to these studies since we employed a longer time frame (seven years) to examine effects of civic competences in adolescence on the political and civic participation of young adults.

A second contribution our studies make to the knowledge base on the effects of citizenship education and civic competences is the use of actual participation as an outcome indicator. Our findings regarding political and civic attitudes of adolescents and their political and civic participation as young adults are in contrast with findings from most cross-sectional studies into the effects of citizenship attitudes of adolescents. These studies, which are mainly based on ICCS data (Schulz et al., 2010, 2018; Torney-Purta et al., 2001), regularly report significant positive effects on the intention to participate in political and civic activities (Gainous & Martens, 2012; Isac et al., 2013; Kahne & Sporte, 2008). Examining the relationship between political attitudes and intentions to become politically active in later life, however, is subject to confounding effects. For example, intended political participation might rather reflect an adolescent's positive or negative attitude toward politics than their actual intention to participate in political activities. The necessity of using actual political and civic participation instead of intended political participation to judge the impact of citizenship education is supported by other longitudinal studies into political and civic participation (Keating & Janmaat, 2016; Neundorff et al., 2016). Quintelier and Blais (2016), who used a time frame of two to three years, found that the intentions of adolescents to participate were only weakly related to their actual participation. This suggests that as the number of years between intended and actual political behavior increases, the weaker the relationship becomes.

A further strength of this study is that in addition to students' civic competences and socialization experiences during early adolescence, their educational achievement at the end of secondary school was also used as a predictor of their long-term actual participation. This enabled us to examine the impact of alternative explanations for political and civic participation (cf. Kam & Palmer, 2008; Persson, 2014). Furthermore, for educational achievement we were able to use actual grades on the national examinations, for three compulsory subjects: Mathematics, Dutch

language and English language. These provide a reliable indicator for the general cognitive level of students.

As regards the measurement of the dependent variables of our study, we used CAPI (Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing) to avoid non-responses to the items in the follow-up questionnaire. Personal interviewing stimulated respondents to think carefully about their answers, which were coded in pre-structured answers by the interviewer. Interviewer-administered survey research in general is prone to social desirability, because it is not completely anonymous (Klausch et al., 2013). We did not explicitly control for socially desirable answering, but next to their actual participation we included questions about whether respondents were willing to participate in the future. This may have prevented over-reporting of actual behavior by respondents (cf. Andolina et al., 2003), as the inclusion of ‘face-saving responses’ removes the tendency to give socially desirable answers (Persson & Solevid, 2014). Respondents thus get credits for expressing their willingness to do an activity before being presented with questions on their actual behavior over the past 12 months (Keeter et al., 2002a, 2003).

This dissertation further contributes to research into political participation among young adults through the development of an inventory for conventional and unconventional political participation. Over the past decades, unconventional political activities in particular have become widespread and popular among young adults (Pilkington & Pollock, 2015; Stockemer & Carbonetti, 2010; Stolle et al., 2005; Zukin et al., 2006). Some scholars, such as Norris (2003), refer to these activities as cause-oriented activities related to specific issues or policy concerns. These cause-oriented activities include signing petitions and demonstrating in local or national protest events. Furthermore, as Hustinx et al. (2011) argue, these activities are not only restricted to political participation, but also encompass civic activities, like shopping for a sick neighbor or donating money to charity. Cause-oriented activities are not only less demanding, because there is usually less commitment needed and the activities are open to anyone (Marien et al., 2010), but they also focus attention upon specific issues and policy concerns (Norris, 2003), such as climate change, gay rights, racism, and global poverty. The interest in and activities around these specific issues characterize the ‘monitorial citizen’: an interested and politically confident citizen that avoids conventional (citizen-oriented) political activities and relies solely on unconventional (cause-oriented) individualized actions (Schudson, 1999). Amnå and Ekman (2013) argue that young adults are interested in politics, but only become active when deemed necessary. They characterize these citizens as ‘standby citizens’,

who stay “alert by maintaining political knowledge and nurturing political interest in order to get involved when needed” (Amnå & Ekman, 2013, p. 277). The empirical evidence for the existence of this type of citizen, however, is still relatively scant (Hooghe & Dejaeghere, 2007), especially among young adults (Beilmann et al., 2018; Hustinx et al., 2011), but further research on this will probably be pursued over the coming years. As our measures of conventional and unconventional political participation address such various aspects of citizen types, the PAYA inventory might be helpful in future studies. To determine politically inactive standby citizens, the PAYA inventory may be supplemented with measurements of civic knowledge, political interest and news consumption, and insights into how young people relate to politics (Sveningsson, 2016).

Besides the several strengths of this study, there are also some limitations. The relatively small sample size was a point of concern in all empirical chapters. Models with more than ten predictors might have suffered from a lack of power to detect statistically significant relations. In Chapter 3, we analyzed a parsimonious model with the most important civic competences and then found a positive association between adolescents’ support for democratic values and unconventional political participation, whereas this association was obscured in the full model. This might be caused by a lack of statistical power in the full model. In line with this, we made economic use of control variables in our models, resulting in a fixed set of three variables, supplemented with control variables relevant to the study in question. As a result, educational track is not included in Chapter 3, and citizenship competences are not included in Chapter 4. In the research design of the study we aimed for a larger sample of approximately 500 young adults. However, tracing young adults after having left secondary school proved to be very difficult. Most schools and municipal agencies were highly reluctant to provide the addresses of their former students. In those cases in which addresses could be obtained, these addresses concerned their parents’ residence. We were unable to check whether the young adults’ parents were still living there, and if they were, whether they had passed on the letter to their son or daughter. Consequently, we had to rely to a large extent on contacting young adults through various methods, with Facebook as the most important channel. This might, however, have induced a problem with self-selection as not every young adult has a Facebook account or is willing to participate. Besides, young adults who agreed to participate in the study were invited to contact former classmates who also took part in the ICCS 2009 study. Although the results of this snowball method were rather disappointing, it nevertheless might have introduced a further bias in our findings.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, contacting respondents from previous large-scale studies seems to be a promising lead for future research, particularly to study long-term effects of educational interventions. It is recommended, for that reason, to request students' permission to use their data for future research. The opportunities offered by the new 'National Cohort for Educational Research' (NCO) to track former students more easily using their national student ID, as well as combining data from large-scale international studies with register data, are likely to overcome several of the difficulties faced in this project over the coming years.

For the second wave of data collection (used in Chapters 3, 4 and 5) we did not obtain a representative sample of Dutch young adults. In our final sample, the respondents had a higher socioeconomic status and the academic tracks were overrepresented compared to the original ICCS 2009 sample. As a result the respondents scored relatively high on civic knowledge compared to the total sample of those who participated in ICCS, and students' socioeconomic status differed considerably between students from the vocational and academic tracks in secondary education (Maslowski et al., 2012; Munniksma et al., 2017). However, for the academic tracks—the higher general secondary education and pre-university tracks (Chapter 5)—our final sample did not deviate strongly from the original ICCS 2009 sample. Due to the lack of a representative sample of young adults, descriptive findings regarding their political and civic participation, other than descriptives to characterize the variables in our data set, were avoided. As our aim was to study relationships between various predictors and the political and civic participation of young adults, the lack of representative data did not necessarily pose a problem. There were no indications that the current sample caused a serious bias in estimating the relationship between civic competences, socialization experiences or educational achievement on the one hand, and young adults' participation in society on the other. An exception might be the different mechanisms regarding the role of socialization experiences for students from the vocational and the academic tracks. For that reason, interaction effects were studied to determine whether these different mechanisms were at play.

A further limitation was that we only had data of two measurement occasions at our disposal, with a seven-year time lag. Students were about 14 years old in the ICCS study (when they were in lower secondary education) and 20 or 21 years old during the follow-up study. The subject of social studies, in which students learn about democratic processes and institutions, is part of the curriculum in upper secondary education, and more prominent in the academic tracks than in the vocational track (Maslowski & van der Werf, 2013). Besides, recent

studies by Wanders (2019) show that the role of parents and peers in developing societal interest changes over time, indicating that the role of parents becomes less important, while the role of peers gains in importance. These influences in the transition from late adolescence to young adulthood were not captured in our studies. In order to further elaborate on predictors of political and civic participation, future longitudinal research needs to add (at least) an in-between wave in late adolescence and take school participation and civic experiences, such as mock elections or service learning, into consideration.

As we had to rely on data from the 2009 ICCS study, our findings might be affected by the use of only a few items to measure socialization experiences, such as the interactions with parents and peers (i.e., the frequency of discussing political and social issues and the frequency of discussing what is happening in the world). Although these items capture some core features of how parents and friends might influence the political interest and commitment of adolescents, they do not capture other relevant aspects, like the political participation of the parents (Cicognani et al., 2012) or the political diversity in the peer group (Quintelier, 2013). Similarly, the influence of associations and the media were measured using the membership of voluntary associations and the frequency of media use to obtain information on political and social issues. These measures do not entail detailed information on the interactions with others in those associations, or the type, amount and quality of information obtained from newspapers, television news or Internet sources.

Lastly, it can be questioned whether political participation at the age of 20 or 21 already reflects an inclination to become politically active during adulthood. Nowadays it takes longer to complete education and find a stable job (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Garcia-Albacete, 2014). It might well be that once young adults have settled down and found a job they shift their focus toward becoming politically active (cf. Nie et al., 1996). A future longitudinal panel study with two or more waves in early and late adolescence, as well as two waves in young adulthood, might provide us more insight into the presence and stability of long-term relationships, as political socialization and the development of political orientations starts in childhood, develops in early and late adolescence, and continues throughout adulthood (Sears & Brown, 2013). The Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) core study among Dutch households is a good starting point in terms of design and content. The age limit of panel participation should then be extended to young adolescence.

Implications for Theory and Practice

The complexity of predicting the political and civic participation of young adults becomes apparent from our studies. Effects from the social setting of adolescents, through discussions on social and political issues with parents and friends, as well as through media or voluntary associations they are involved in, were not found. Neither did our study reveal profound effects of adolescents' general academic performance on their political participation as young adults.

In the conceptualization of political participation, the conceptualization of van Deth (2014) was used to distinguish conventional and unconventional political participation. The two political participation scales combined both online and offline political activities into the same type of political participation. Although previous studies have assumed a distinction between online and offline subtypes of political participation (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Vissers & Stolle, 2014), the boundaries between online and offline participation seem to be less sharp than those studies suggest. Moreover, the delineation of online political participation is still under debate. Critics of the framework of van Deth (2014), for instance, suggest that classifying online activities on social network sites as forms of political participation is ambiguous, as the aim or intention of these activities is difficult to assess (Hosch-Dayican, 2014). For example, do we recognize regular online political activities, such as sharing a political message from a friend on social media, or watching a political event online via Facebook livestream, as political behavior? As some of these activities may be politically oriented, while others are not, measuring political participation poses a challenge for further research on political participation (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018).

Civic knowledge and support for democratic values were identified in this dissertation as significant predictors of political participation. Previous review studies suggest that a formal citizenship education curriculum plays an important role in the development of civic competences, specifically civic knowledge (Geboers et al., 2013; Isac et al., 2013), and political participation (Manning & Edwards, 2014). However, citizenship attitudes seem to be less shaped in formal education, and studies report a 'dip' in these attitudes for 14 to 16 year olds (Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, Jorgensen, & ten Dam, 2015; Keating et al., 2010). Isac (2015) indicated that, although her results were also based on the outcomes of 14 year olds, schools barely play a role in students' acquisition of non-cognitive outcomes like civic attitudes, values, and behavioral dispositions. Moreover, in our study, we found no evidence for the predictive role of attitudes for longer-term political and civic participation. For this reason, a focus on enhancing students' civic knowledge,

given its relationship with political participation in young adulthood, and its learnability at school, seems to be a more promising lead to pursue.

Chapter 4 suggested that the impact of political discussions with peers differs between pre-vocational and pre-university students. It could be that the discussions of pre-vocational students are of a different nature than those of pre-university students. For example, discussions among pre-vocational students might express frustrations or lack of trust, resulting in rejection of political institutions, whereas discussions among pre-university students might be of a more constructive nature—expressing their willingness to become politically active (cf. Dahl et al., 2018; Glasford, 2008). Another explanation might be that among both pre-vocational and pre-university students, discussions with friends reflect an interest in political and social issues, but that pre-university students have the resources and network to become active (Klofstad, 2007). Political participation, as Brady, Verba, and Schlozman (1994) argued, is not only dependent on political interest, but also on time available and civic skills, as well as on being part of a network that mobilizes people to become active (see Verba et al., 1995). Without these resources and networks, young adults need to overcome extra hurdles to become politically active.

Social media reaches young non-participants and has the potential to mobilize them (Vissers & Stolle, 2014). Judging from recent worldwide demonstrations against racism and climate change, young people are mobilized online to express their concerns about political and social issues. By all means, the media attention for these societal issues also offer teachers the opportunity to introduce their students to citizenship themes, such as diversity in schools and society. These themes will also become part of the curriculum in both primary and secondary education in the Netherlands within the next few years. Teachers can play an important role in motivating their students to participate civically and politically later on (Jacobsen & Casalaspi, 2016; Wanders, 2019).

In conclusion, this dissertation has provided empirical evidence that adolescents with more civic knowledge participate more frequently in conventional and unconventional political activities in young adulthood. Assuming that school contributes to students' civic knowledge, the school seems to be able to play a role in activating political participation. As democracy is inconceivable without the political participation of citizens, and parents, peers, the media and voluntary associations have only a modest long-term role instigating political participation according to our findings, the results of the studies presented here underline the potential importance of including citizenship education in the core curriculum of Dutch schools.

Addendum

Appendices

Samenvatting (Dutch Summary)

References

About the Author

Dankwoord (Acknowledgements)

ICO Dissertation Series

Appendix A

Table A1
Indicators of Political Participation in Two Versions of Questionnaires

Varying response categories	Questionnaire I		Questionnaire II	
	Two	Three	Two	Three
Indicators				
Offline political participation	X			X
Online political participation	X		X	
No variation				
Voting	X		X	
Political interest			X	
Political trust	X		X	
Social trust	X		X	
Media use			X	
Civic involvement	X		X	
Background characteristics	X		X	

Appendix A-II

Description of the 38 political participation items⁷

Voting in the 2012 national election
Deliberately abstain from voting in the 2012 national election
Voting in the 2014 municipal election
Deliberately abstain from voting in the 2014 municipal election
Voting in the 2014 European election
Deliberately abstain from voting in the 2014 European election
 Candidate for a political party
 Contacted a political party
 Worked in a political party or political action group
 Member of a political party
 Contacted a politician or civil servant
Attended a consultation or election meeting
Participate in co-determination body in a company, at school or training centre
 Worn or displayed a badge/T-shirt stating a political message
 Contacted the media
 Followed a politician or party (online)
 Visited a website of a political party or politician
 Forwarded e-mail with political content
 Signed up for a political e-news bulletin
 Taken part in a public demonstration
 Taken part in a political forum or discussion group
 Taken part in a strike or protest march
Spray political slogans on walls
Sabotage or blocking of (rail) roads
Occupying buildings
 Responded positively to an invitation to a political meeting (online)
 Attended a meeting or lecture about a civic issue
 Posted an article or video about politics (online)
 Supported a societal-political group (like and share)
 Deliberately bought certain products for political or ethical reasons
 Boycotted certain products for political or ethical reasons
 Signed a petition (online)
 Written a blog on political subject
 Created a new group or activity for a political event
 Written a letter to a newspaper or magazine
 Posted a political message on social media
 Attended a cultural or fundraising event with political content
 Used a share-button to share a link to a political website

⁷ The items in italics are not included in the Mokken Scale Analysis – item selection procedure.

Appendix A-III

Table A2
Mokken Scale Analysis: Item Selection Procedure II

Items	Scales Mean	Items	Lower bound = .3		Lower bound = .5			
			1	2	1	2	3	4
Candidate for a political party (c)	.01	.41						
Contacted a political party (c)	.02	.88			.90			
Worked in a political party or political action group (c)	.03	.72			.74			
Member of a political party (c)	.03	.76			.81			
Contacted a politician or civil servant (c)	.05	.46			.54			
Worn or displayed a badge/T-shirt stating a political message (c)	.05	.42			.57			
Contacted the media (c)	.06	.44						.55
Followed a politician or party (online) (c)	.19	.46						.55
Visited a website of a political party or politician (online) (c)	.42	.51			.51			
Taken part in a public demonstration (u)	.07	-		.47				.57
Taken part in a political forum or discussion group (u)	.07	.48			.52			
Taken part in a strike or protest march (u)	.09	-		.50				
Responded positively to an invitation to a political meeting (online) (u)	.15	.53			.64			
Attended a meeting or lecture about a civic issue (u)	.21	.47			.62			
Posted an article or video about politics(online) (u)	.22	.43						.57
Supported a societal-political group (like and share) (online) (u)	.24	.46						
Deliberately bought certain products for political or ethical reasons (u)	.33	-		.68		.77		
Boycotted certain products for political or ethical reasons (u)	.36	-		.71		.79		
Signed a petition (u)	.42	.45			.46			
H		.49	.62		.58	.76	.57	.55

Appendix B

Table B1

Logistic Regression Analysis - Robustness Check

	Conventional Political Participation						Unconventional Political Participation					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Beta	SD	Beta	SD	Beta	SD	Beta	SD	Beta	SD	Beta	SD
Gender	-.16	.11			-.16	.11	.01	.13			.01	.13
Religion	.20†	.11			.20†	.11	.19	.13			.19	.13
SES	.21†	.11			.19	.14	.18	.12			.07	.16
General secondary ^(a)	.19	.17			.11	.22	.50*	.24			.48	.30
Pre-University ^(a)	.29†	.17			.24	.22	.41	.25			.43	.31
Pol. Discussion Parents			.26	.22	.18	.12			-.21	.21	-.14	.13
Open Classroom Climate			.06	.13	.06	.12			.12	.12	.12	.12
Involvement Associations			.10	.13	.11	.12			.26	.15†	.27	.14†
Pol. Discussion Peers			-.24	.23	-.08	.13			.32	.24	.24	.17
Media Trad.			.03	.13	.14	.11			.08	.14	.09	.10
Media Int.			.23	.19	.13	.11			-.11	.18	.05	.12
Chi ² Nagelkerke (df)	10.73* (7)		28.62** (8)		142.24** (52)		10.73* (7)		28.62** (8)		142.24** (52)	
R ²	.18		.08		.24		.21		.13		.32	

Note. Beta (S.E.) are displayed

^(a) Reference category = Pre-Vocational.

** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$ and † $p < 0.1$.

Appendix C

Reporting missing values

1. Structure of missing data

- 26 persons with missing values, 85 persons with complete data.
- Reasons for missing data:
 - Regarding academic achievement: the link with data of Statistics Netherlands was unsuccessful because, the personal data were: 1. not sufficiently unique, 2. incorrectly transmitted, 3. incorrectly written down by the interviewer.
 - Regarding covariates: error on the form, box not filled.
- Percentages of missing data for each independent variable is reported in Table C1.

Table C1

Missingness per independent variable

Independent variabele	% Missing
Dutch (grade)	14.4 (16 respondents)
English (grade)	14.4
Mathematics (grade)	18 (20 respondents)
SES	2.7
Civic knowledge	0.9
Mathematics level (dummy)	18
Democratic attitude	3.6
Gender	-
Religious background	-

2. Procedure of repairing missing data with Multiple Imputation

In multiple imputation (MI) a separate imputation and analysis model is used, which benefits the use of auxiliary variables. In simulations, MI and FIML (another imputation method) show roughly the same results (Graham, 2003). Missingness at random is assumed in both methods: The reason for the missingness of the achievement data depends on other observed data, and not on the achievement data themselves (e.g., persons with poor performance are missing in the data).

3. Which variables do we include in the model (specific role)?

The general advice is to include as many relevant variables as possible in the imputation model, so that the assumption of Missing at Random (the missingness depends on other observed value) is more plausible (Collins, Schafer, & Kam, 2001).

- Dependent variables: Conventional political participation, unconventional political participation and civic participation
- Academic achievement variables : Mathematics, English and Dutch (final examination grades)
- Covariates: Civic knowledge, democratic attitude
- Background characteristics: Gender, SES, Religious background, Educational level & Math level.
- Interaction variable: Educational level X Math level

Auxiliary variables in Imputation Model

The auxiliary variables are moderately correlated with the imputed variables

- Political efficacy ($r = .32$ with English)
- Political discussion with friends ($r = .28$ with Mathematics)
- Spare time activities, activities like: playing computer games, meeting friends ($r = -.28$ with Dutch, $r = -.21$ with Mathematics)
- Equal rights for ethnic minorities ($r = .20$ with Dutch, $r = .17$ with English)
- Reading for enjoyment ($r = .17$ with English, $r = .16$ with Dutch)
- Expected educational level ($r = .28$ with English, $r = .21$ with Mathematics level, but also a .41 correlation with educational level)

4. Distribution of variables between persons with complete and incomplete data based on academic achievement.

Chi-square analysis - complete vs missing cases

- Educational level (general secondary & pre-university): $\chi^2 = .279$, $p = .598$
- Gender (male & female): $\chi^2 = .147$, $p = .701$
- Religious background (no & yes): $\chi^2 = .008$, $p = .929$

T-tests - complete vs missing cases

Table C2

T-tests of Complete and Incomplete Data

	Incomplete data (N=16/20)		Complete data (N=90/95)		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i> (df)
Onconventional pol. participation	3.06	2	3.75	2	1.11 (108)
Conventional pol. participation	1.11	1	.90	1	-.98 (108)
Civic engagement	1.13	1	1.56	1	1.43 (108)
Expected education	3.13	.89	3.22	.98	-.35 (107)
SES	.08	1	.18	.35	.35 (105)
Civic knowledge	159.9	9	156.2	9	-1.64 (107)
Political efficacy	2.44	2	2.17	2	-1.73 (104)
Democratic attitudes	3.35	.4	3.39	.4	.34 (104)
Reading enjoyment	2.18	1	2.38	1	.68 (107)
Activities spare time	3.02	.7	2.97	.7	-.27 (108)
Political discussion friends	1.60	.7	1.88	.7	.96 (108)
Ethnic equality	3.25	.5	3.05	.5	-1.40 (106)

5. How are the imputations be generated?

Imputations generated via a Fully Conditional Specification model (in SPSS) (van Buuren et al., 2006). Each variable has its own model, depending on the nature of the variable. This is recommended because I impute both continuous and categorical variables (the exam grades, and the math level; therefore, both linear and logistic regression). This method is also referred to in the literature as MICE, Multiple imputation by chained equations.

6. Number of imputed datasets

20, this is linked to the percentage of missing cases (highest for Mathematics: 18%).

7. Restrictions to be imposed on variables in the model

Academic achievement scores are between 10 and 100.

8. How will the imputed datasets be analyzed

Data will be analyzed in MPlus, because SPSS does not support multivariate analysis for aggregated (pooled) coefficients (of 20 datasets). Multivariate analysis will be performed on the data with MI as well as on the complete cases data.

References

- Collins, L. M., Schafer, J. L., & Kam, C. M. (2001). A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 330–51.
- Graham, J. W. (2003). Adding missing-data-relevant variables to FIML-based structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 10, 80–100.
- van Buuren, S., Brand, J. P. L., Groothuis-Oudshoorn, C. G. M., & Rubin, D. B. (2006). Fully conditional specification in multivariate imputation. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 76(12), 1049–1064.

Appendix D

Table D1

Models with Interactions. Standardized Coefficients Beta (SE) are Reported

	Model 3.1			Model 4.1		
	Conventional participation	Unconventional participation	Civic participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic
Intercept	.70 (1.18)	.10 (1.25)	.67 (1.26)	-1.23 (2.33)	-3.00 (2.41)	.08 (2.40)
Gender	-.18† (.10)	.09 (.10)	.23* (.10)	-.18† (.10)	.10 (.10)	.23* (.10)
SES	.13 (.10)	.22* (.11)	-.03 (.11)	.11 (.10)	.18† (.11)	-.04 (.11)
Religion	.29** (.09)	.08 (.10)	.20* (.09)	.30** (.09)	.10 (.10)	.20* (.09)
Civic knowledge				.16 (.11)	.11 (.11)	.01 (.11)
Democratic attitudes				-.12 (.10)	.16 (.10)	.06 (.10)
Dutch	.04 (.18)	.02 (.18)	-.21 (.18)	.03 (.18)	.03 (.18)	-.20 (.19)
English	-.11 (.18)	.09 (.19)	-.13 (.19)	-.11 (.18)	.03 (.19)	-.14 (.20)
Math	-.11 (.18)	-.21 (.19)	.15 (.18)	-.11 (.18)	-.20 (.19)	.15 (.19)
Math subject	-.11 (.19)	-.06 (.22)	-.04 (.22)	-.12 (.19)	.04 (.22)	-.05 (.22)
Track	-.97 (.71)	-.35 (.76)	-.87 (.76)	-.88 (.69)	-.31 (.75)	-.87 (.76)
Math subject x Track	-.04 (.22)	-.13 (.23)	.07 (.23)	-.04 (.21)	-.13 (.23)	.08 (.23)
Dutch x Track	-.13 (.67)	.44 (.69)	.64 (.66)	-.14 (.66)	.41 (.68)	.64 (.66)
English x Track	.30 (.64)	-.60 (.72)	.04 (.66)	.24 (.63)	-.65 (.75)	.03 (.67)
Math x Track	1.03† (.57)	.67 (.61)	.35 (.57)	.97† (.56)	.63 (.60)	.35 (.57)
Partial correlation						
Conv.	1			1		
Unconv.	.46	1		.46	1	
Civic	.20	.28	1	.20	.27	1
Model fit						
R ²	.22	.13	.20	.25	.16	.21
χ ² (df) ^a	52.61* (36): $p = .036$			63.31* (42) $p = .018$		

Note.

† $p < .1$, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; ^aχ² of entire model and additions to model 1.

Table D2
Multivariate Regression Analysis – Complete Cases. Standardized Coefficients Beta (SE) are Reported ^a

	Model I			Model II			Model III			Model IV		
	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic Participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic Participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic
Intercept	-.20 (.16)	-.33 (.16)	-.40 (.17)	-2.46 (2.02)	-4.04 (2.19)	-1.71 (2.16)	-1.04 (.81)	-.80 (.91)	-1.01 (.85)	-2.05 (2.06)	-3.95 (2.28)	-1.56 (2.17)
Gender	-.01 (.10)	.17† (.11)	.26 (.10)	-.02 (.10)	.19† (.10)	.27** (.10)	-.05 (.11)	.14 (.11)	.20† (.10)	-.05 (.11)	.15 (.09)	.21* (.09)
SES	.26* (.10)	.19† (.11)	-.01 (.11)	.21* (.11)	.10 (.11)	-.04 (.12)	.19† (.11)	.16 (.12)	-.02 (.12)	.18 (.11)	.12 (.12)	-.03 (.12)
Religious affiliation	.31** (.10)	.11 (.11)	.14 (.10)	.32** (.10)	.12 (.10)	.14 (.10)	.32** (.09)	.11 (.11)	.14 (.10)	.32** (.09)	.12 (.10)	.15 (.10)
Civic knowledge				.16 (.11)	.11 (.10)	.02 (.11)				.10 (.10)	.10 (.13)	-.02 (.12)
Democratic attitudes				-.06 (.10)	.21* (.10)	.12 (.11)				-.08 (.09)	.22* (.11)	.14 (.11)
Dutch							-.01 (.12)	.07 (.13)	.01 (.12)	-.02 (.12)	.08 (.13)	.03 (.12)
English							-.04 (.12)	-.04 (.13)	-.14 (.12)	-.04 (.13)	-.12 (.13)	-.17 (.13)
Math							.20* (.10)	.04 (.11)	.25* (.10)	.19† (.11)	.02 (.11)	.25* (.11)
Math subject							-.08 (.10)	-.06 (.11)	.03 (.11)	-.09 (.10)	-.04 (.11)	-.05 (.11)
Track							.16 (.10)	.11 (.11)	.10 (.11)	.14 (.11)	.05 (.11)	.09 (.11)
Partial correlation												
Conv.	1			1			1			1		
Unconv.	.48	1		.47	1		.46	1		.47	1	
Civic	.28	.36	1	.28	.33	1	.23	.34	1	.24	.31	.31
Model fit												
R ²	.14	.06	.08	.16	.11	.10	.18	.08	.15	.21	.13	.18
χ ² (df) ^b	24.96** (9); <i>p</i> = .003			36.10** (15); <i>p</i> = .002			37.76** (24); <i>p</i> = .037			49.49* (30) <i>p</i> = .014		

Note. † *p* < .1, * *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01; ^a based on 85 respondents; ^b χ² of entire model and additions to model 1.

Table D3

Models with Interactions: Standardized Coefficients Beta (SE) are Reported.^a

	Model III.I			Model IV.I.		
	Conventional Participation	Unconventional Participation	Civic Participation	Conv.	Unconv.	Civic.
Intercept	.76 (.141)	.46 (1.24)	.11 (1.31)	-.28 (2.41)	-2.21(2.68)	-.15 (2.54)
Gender	-.10 (.11)	.09 (.11)	.15 (.11)	-.10 (.11)	.09 (.11)	.15 (.11)
SES	.17 (.11)	.14 (.12)	-.05 (.11)	.17 (.11)	.10 (.12)	-.05 (.11)
Religious Affiliation	.29** (.10)	.10 (.11)	.13 (.10)	.30** (.10)	.11 (.11)	.13 (.10)
Civic Knowledge				.08 (.12)	.08 (.13)	-.05 (.12)
Democratic Attitudes				-.08 (.10)	.23* (.10)	.15 (.10)
Dutch	.01 (.19)	-.17 (.21)	-.12 (.20)	.01 (.19)	-.15 (.20)	-.11 (.20)
English	.04 (.19)	.16 (.19)	.07 (.19)	.04 (.19)	.10 (.19)	.06 (.19)
Math	-.23 (.19)	-.23 (.22)	-.07 (.22)	-.23 (.21)	-.24 (.22)	-.08 (.20)
Math Subject Track	.01 (.24)	.08 (.24)	.09 (.23)	-.01 (.24)	.06 (.24)	.09 (.25)
	-.90 (.74)	-.88 (.80)	-.61 (.77)	-.85 (.75)	-.78 (.79)	-.63 (.76)
Math Subject x Track	-.09 (.26)	-.16 (.26)	-.06 (.27)	-.08 (.26)	-.11 (.28)	-.06 (.27)
Dutch x Track	-.08 (.70)	1.09 (.74)	.63 (.71)	-.13 (.70)	1.06 (.73)	.67 (.70)
English x Track	-.22 (.69)	-.83 (.74)	-.90 (.71)	.22 (.69)	-.94 (.72)	-.93 (.70)
Math x Track	1.47* (.60)	.87 (.66)	1.07† (.63)	1.45* (.60)	.84 (.64)	1.08† (.62)
Partial correlation						
Conv.	1			1		
Unconv.	.42	1		.43	1	
Civic	.19	.29	1	.20	.27	1
Model fit						
R ²	.25	.13	.21	.26	.18	.23
χ ² (df) ^b	49.75† (36) p=.063			62.20* (42) p=.023		

Note. † $p < .1$, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

^a Based on 85 respondents. ^b χ² of entire model and additions to model.

A large, stylized silhouette of a tree with many leaves, positioned on the left side of the page. The tree's trunk and branches extend across the upper half of the page, with its canopy reaching towards the top right. The leaves are represented by small, dark, oval shapes.

Samenvatting (Dutch Summary)

De bevordering van actief burgerschap
bij jongvolwassenen

De voorspellende waarde van burgerschapscompetenties, politieke
socialisatie en onderwijsprestaties tijdens de adolescentie

Inleiding

Een democratie veronderstelt politieke participatie van burgers. Door deel te nemen aan politieke activiteiten kunnen burgers hun voorkeuren en opvattingen kenbaar maken, en op die manier invloed uitoefenen op de keuzes die de overheid maakt (Schlozman, Verba, & Brady, 1999). Een zorgwekkende ontwikkeling in dat kader is dat steeds minder mensen lid zijn van een politieke partij, en in verschillende landen de opkomst bij verkiezingen afneemt (Putnam, 2000; Whiteley, 2011). Deze ontwikkeling is het meest duidelijk zichtbaar bij jongvolwassenen (Henn et al., 2005; O'Toole et al., 2003). Jongvolwassenen, de leeftijdsgroep waarop dit proefschrift zich richt, worden daarbij opgevat als jongeren in de leeftijd van 18 tot 24 jaar (Jekielek & Brown, 2005).

Om jongvolwassenen voor te bereiden op politieke en maatschappelijke activiteiten (Kerr, 2003; O'Toole et al., 2003; Putnam, 2000), zijn scholen in veel Europese landen verplicht, of worden zij gestimuleerd, om hun leerlingen onderwijs te geven in burgerschap (Eurydice, 2017). In Nederland is sinds 2006 een wet van kracht die scholen verplicht om burgerschap en de sociale integratie van leerlingen actief te bevorderen. De onderliggende veronderstelling is dat leerlingen leren over de democratische rechtsstaat en zelf oefenen met democratie op school en daarbuiten, waardoor ze belangrijke burgerschapscompetenties verwerven die hen in staat stellen als volwassenen actief deel te nemen aan de samenleving. Burgerschapscompetenties worden opgevat als een combinatie van maatschappelijke en politieke kennis, vaardigheden, attitudes en waarden (Hoskins et al., 2008).

Het doel van dit onderzoek was om na te gaan in hoeverre burgerschapscompetenties van 14-jarige leerlingen in de onderbouw van het voortgezet onderwijs hun deelname aan de samenleving als jongvolwassenen voorspellen, dan wel in hoeverre andere factoren, zoals de stimulering via ouders en leeftijdsgenoten of het algemeen cognitief niveau van de leerlingen zelf, alternatieve verklaringen bieden voor hun latere politieke en maatschappelijke participatie.

Participatie in de samenleving is in dit proefschrift opgevat als bestaande uit twee dimensies: politieke participatie en maatschappelijke participatie. Politieke participatie is gedefinieerd als een *vrijwillige activiteit van burgers op het gebied van de overheid, politiek of de staat* (van Deth, 2014, p. 354). Politieke participatie is zelf ook op te delen in twee vormen, namelijk conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie (zie Barrett & Zani, 2015). De eerste vorm, conventionele politieke participatie, heeft betrekking op verkiezingen en de representatieve democratie, en

omvat activiteiten zoals stemmen, contact zoeken met politici en campagne voeren voor een politieke partij. De tweede vorm, onconventionele politieke participatie, valt buiten het kader van formele verkiezingen en van de politieke instituties behorend tot de representatieve democratie. Onconventionele politieke participatie behelst activiteiten zoals het ondertekenen van petitie's, demonstreren, en boycotten van bepaalde producten of evenementen (vgl. Linssen et al., 2018; Pachi & Barrett, 2012; van der Meer & van Ingen, 2009). Maatschappelijke participatie wordt in tegenstelling tot politieke participatie niet geleid door politieke ideeën of belangen. Het is gedefinieerd als *de deelname van een burger aan het leven in een gemeenschap om de omstandigheden voor anderen te verbeteren of om de toekomst van de gemeenschap vorm te geven* (Adler & Goggin, 2005, p. 241). Maatschappelijke participatie behelst activiteiten zoals vrijwilligerswerk, hulp bieden aan anderen, en het doneren aan een goed doel (e.g., Zukin et al., 2006).

Opzet van het onderzoek

Om de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie onder jongvolwassenen te meten, zijn een index voor maatschappelijke participatie en twee schalen voor respectievelijk conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie ontwikkeld. Om de politieke participatie van jongvolwassenen in kaart te brengen is een nieuwe vragenlijst ontwikkeld, de vragenlijst 'Politieke Activiteiten van Jongvolwassenen' (Engelse afkorting PAYA), die zowel conventionele als onconventionele vormen van participatie in kaart brengt. De vragenlijst richt zich zowel op online als offline als politieke activiteiten en is specifiek gericht op jongvolwassenen (18 tot 24 jaar).

Vervolgens is een longitudinaal panelonderzoek uitgevoerd om te bepalen in hoeverre de burgerschapscompetenties, kenmerken van politieke socialisatie en het algemeen cognitief niveau van adolescenten, van invloed zijn op de politieke en maatschappelijke deelname als jongvolwassenen in de samenleving. In het kader van een internationaal onderzoek naar burgerschapsonderwijs (Engelse afkorting ICCS; Schulz et al., 2010) vulden 2491 (14-jarige) Nederlandse leerlingen in klas 2 van het voortgezet onderwijs in 2009 een kennistoets en een vragenlijst in over onder andere hun betrokkenheid bij burgerschapsactiviteiten binnen en buiten school, en hun politieke attitudes en waarden. Na een periode van ongeveer zeven jaar werden de op dat moment 21-jarige jongvolwassenen geïnterviewd. In totaal hebben 134 jongvolwassenen in 2016 deelgenomen aan het vervolgonderzoek.

Het proefschrift heeft tot doel na te gaan in hoeverre burgerschapscompetenties van 14-jarige adolescenten van invloed zijn op hun politieke en maatschappelijke

participatie als jongvolwassenen. In hoofdstuk 3 is daartoe onderzocht of de burgerschapskennis van leerlingen, het onderschrijven van democratische basiswaarden, hun politieke zelfvertrouwen, hun houding ten opzichte van geëngageerd en op plichtsbesef gebaseerd burgerschap en hun deelname aan buitenschoolse maatschappelijke activiteiten in en buiten de school, gerelateerd zijn aan hun politieke en maatschappelijke participatie in de jongvolwassenheid. In eerder onderzoek bleek dat burgerschapskennis, het onderschrijven van democratische waarden en politiek zelfvertrouwen gerelateerd zijn aan de intenties voor toekomstige politieke participatie (e.g., Bengtsson & Christensen, 2014; Cho & McLeod, 2007; Galston, 2001; Verba et al., 1995), maar onduidelijk is of deze burgerschapscompetenties ook leiden tot hun daadwerkelijke deelname aan de samenleving als jongvolwassenen. Ander onderzoek liet zien dat op plichtsbesef gebaseerde en geëngageerde burgerschapsattitudes belangrijk waren voor verschillende typen politieke participatie (Dalton, 2008), terwijl de deelname van adolescenten aan buitenschoolse maatschappelijke activiteiten verband hield met zowel politieke als maatschappelijke participatie in jongvolwassenheid (Dassonneville et al., 2012; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006; Keating & Janmaat, 2015).

Om het verband tussen de verworven burgerschapscompetenties tijdens de adolescentie en daadwerkelijke latere participatie in de samenleving in een bredere context te onderzoeken, zijn twee alternatieve verklaringen onderzocht. Deze alternatieve verklaringen voor de toekomstige politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van adolescenten hebben betrekking op de socialisatie-ervaringen in de vroege adolescentie (Hoofdstuk 4) en de onderwijsprestaties in de late adolescentie (Hoofdstuk 5).

Het tweede doel van dit proefschrift was om na te gaan in hoeverre kenmerken van politieke socialisatie van adolescenten door discussies met ouders en vrienden, hun mediagebruik en hun betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersverenigingen, hun politieke en maatschappelijke participatie als jongvolwassenen kunnen voorspellen. Terwijl het onderzoek naar burgerschapscompetenties in de eerste plaats gericht was op de invloed van school, kan worden gesteld dat andere vormen van politieke socialisatie ook kunnen bijdragen aan de kennis, de interesse, het vertrouwen en het netwerk (bronnen van sociaal kapitaal) die jongeren in staat stellen actieve burgers te worden. Politieke discussies binnen het gezin spelen bijvoorbeeld een belangrijke rol bij de ontwikkeling van maatschappelijke attitudes, kennis en politieke activiteiten van adolescenten (zie Andolina et al., 2003; Jennings et al., 2009; McDevitt & Kioussis, 2007). Ook leidt vroege betrok-

kenheid bij vrijwilligersverenigingen tot meer maatschappelijke participatie in jong-volwassenheid (McFarland & Thomas, 2006). In de late adolescentie hangt politieke discussie tussen leeftijdsgenoten en de toegang tot media samen met meer maatschappelijke participatie (Ekström & Östman, 2013; Wanders, 2019).

Het derde doel van dit proefschrift was om te bepalen in hoeverre algemene academische prestaties de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen kunnen voorspellen. Naast hun ervaringen met politieke socialisatie werd het effect van de schoolprestaties van leerlingen onderzocht als een tweede alternatieve verklaring. De onderliggende aanname is dat, in plaats van door specifieke burgerschapscompetenties, de deelname van jongvolwassenen aan politieke en maatschappelijke activiteiten wordt gestimuleerd door hun algemeen vermogen om politieke en sociale processen te begrijpen, en draagvlak te creëren voor oplossingen, alsmede het initiëren hiervan (vgl. Campbell, 2006). Daarnaast krijgen hoger opgeleiden over het algemeen meer invloedrijke posities in de samenleving en sociale netwerken, en zullen ze daardoor meer worden aangemoedigd om actief deel te nemen aan de samenleving (zie Nie et al., 1996; Verba et al, 1995).

In de volgende paragrafen zullen de resultaten van de vier empirische hoofdstukken worden samengevat en besproken, en zullen algemene conclusies worden gepresenteerd. Daarnaast wordt ingegaan op beperkingen van de studies en worden de algemene opbrengsten van dit proefschrift besproken. Deze samenvatting eindigt met implicaties en aanbevelingen voor de praktijk en voor verder onderzoek.

Het meten van politieke participatie

In hoofdstuk 2 stond de eerste onderzoeksvraag centraal: *In hoeverre voldoet een nieuw te ontwikkelen instrument voor het meten van politieke participatie aan de psychometrische eisen van schaalbaarheid, betrouwbaarheid en validiteit?* Uit literatuuronderzoek kwam naar voren dat bestaande instrumenten voor het meten van politieke participatie tekortkomingen hadden. Ze waren niet of slechts in beperkte mate gericht waren op het in kaart brengen van de onconventionele politieke participatie van jongvolwassenen, onvoldoende rekening hielden met online vormen van politieke participatie, vaak slechts een paar politieke activiteiten omvatten en/of niet gericht waren op activiteiten die voor jongvolwassenen (18 tot 24 jaar oud) relevant zijn. In dit onderzoek is een nieuwe vragenlijst ontwikkeld, genaamd PAYA, om zowel conventionele als onconventionele politieke participatie

in kaart te brengen. Het PAYA-instrument bouwt voort op items van verschillende bestaande instrumenten (Hirzalla & van Zoonen, 2011; Howard et al., 2007; Keeter et al., 2002; Thomassen, 2001), waaraan een aantal online activiteiten, zoals bloggen en online politici volgen, zijn toegevoegd (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Barrett & Brunton-Smith, 2014; Oser et al., 2012; Quintelier & Theocharis, 2013).

Aangezien sommige politieke activiteiten veeleisender zijn in termen van inspanning en loyaliteit dan andere, is het waarschijnlijk dat aan deze activiteiten door minder jongvolwassenen wordt deelgenomen of dat aan deze activiteiten minder frequent wordt deelgenomen. Gegeven deze verschillen in 'populariteit' van politieke activiteiten is gebruik gemaakt van een Mokken Schaal-analyse (MSA; Mokken & Lewis, 1982; Sijtsma & Molenaar, 2002) om schalen van politieke participatie te construeren. Een eerste versie van een vragenlijst met 38 politieke participatie-items werd getest op 177 Nederlandse jongvolwassenen van 17 tot 25 jaar. Een initiële exploratieve itemselectieprocedure met MSA resulteerde in meerdere schalen met gefragmenteerde subtypen van politieke participatie die moeilijk te interpreteren waren. Bovendien werden in de MSA enkele kernactiviteiten van politieke participatie, zoals deelname aan een demonstratie, uitgesloten. Daarom werd MSA vervolgens uitgevoerd op de twee vooraf bepaalde vormen van politieke participatie: conventionele en onconventionele. De analyse van elk van de twee vormen van politieke participatie resulteerde in twee coherente schalen bestaande uit 9 items voor conventionele politieke participatie (bijvoorbeeld 'lid zijn van een politieke partij' en 'online een politicus of partij volgen') en 10 items voor onconventionele politieke participatie (bijvoorbeeld 'deelnemen aan een openbare demonstratie' en 'een politieke boodschap of video online zetten').

De convergente validiteit van het PAYA-instrument werd ondersteund door een sterke positieve samenhang van zowel conventionele als onconventionele politieke participatie met politieke interesse. Politiek en sociaal vertrouwen bleken matig samen te hangen met conventionele participatie en zwak samen te hangen met onconventionele participatie. Het mediagebruik in de politiek was zowel matig gecorreleerd met conventionele als on-conventionele politieke participatie. Alles bij elkaar weerspiegelen deze resultaten de bevindingen van eerdere onderzoeken naar politieke participatie (e.g., Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Quintelier, 2013; van Stekelenburg et al., 2016; Verba et al., 1995). Het PAYA-instrument is gebruikt in de studies die in hoofdstuk 3 tot en met 5 zijn beschreven.

De voorspellende waarde van burgerschapscompetenties

Hoofdstuk 3 richtte zich op de tweede onderzoeksvraag: *In hoeverre wordt de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongeren voorspeld door hun burgerschapscompetenties als adolescenten?* Burgerschapscompetenties zijn gemeten in ICCS 2009 door middel van de burgerschapskennis van 14-jarige adolescenten, hun steun aan democratische basiswaarden (d.w.z. het recht van vrije meningsuiting, en vrije verkiezing van politieke leiders), attitudes ten aanzien van geëngageerd en op plichtsbesef gebaseerd burgerschap (d.w.z. verwachtingen over de rol van burgers in de politiek en de samenleving), politiek zelfvertrouwen en deelname aan buitenschoolse maatschappelijke activiteiten in en buiten de school. Zeven jaar later werd de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie gemeten in een vervolginterview met 134 jongvolwassenen.

Met behulp van een multivariate multiple regressieanalyse is de invloed van burgerschapscompetenties op de conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie onderzocht. Jongeren met meer kennis over burgerschap blijken als jongvolwassene meer deel te nemen aan zowel conventionele als onconventionele politieke activiteiten. Steun voor democratische waarden was positief gerelateerd aan onconventionele politieke participatie, maar niet aan conventionele politieke participatie. De manier waarop deze democratische waarden zijn geoperationaliseerd, verwijzend naar ‘protestgedrag’ en ‘het recht van vrije meningsuiting’, lijkt enigszins op de conceptualisering van onconventionele politieke participatie, wat draait om activiteiten buiten de politieke instituties om (zoals het boycotten van producten, en politieke discussies via online forums). De houding van adolescenten ten aanzien van op plichtsbesef gebaseerd en geëngageerd burgerschap maakte geen verschil voor de mate waarin zij later politiek of maatschappelijk actief worden. Hoewel geëngageerd burgerschap, zoals het geven van steun aan vreedzame protesten tegen wetten die als onrechtvaardig worden beschouwd, lijkt samen te vallen met redenen voor deelname aan onconventionele politieke activiteiten (Dalton, 2008b), werd er in onze studie geen samenhang tussen beide gevonden. Hetzelfde geldt voor de veronderstelde samenhang tussen op plichtsbesef gebaseerd burgerschap, zoals het als een plicht beschouwen om te gaan stemmen, en conventionele politieke participatie (vgl. Bolzendahl & Coffé, 2013). Daarnaast namen adolescenten met meer politiek zelfvertrouwen (d.w.z. er vertrouwen in hebben dat ze kunnen deelnemen aan politiek) en adolescenten die eerder hadden deelgenomen aan buitenschoolse activiteiten, niet vaker deel aan politieke en maatschappelijke activiteiten als

jongvolwassenen dan adolescenten die minder politiek zelfvertrouwen hadden en minder actief waren tijdens hun schoolcarrière.

Het meest in het oog springende resultaat van deze studie is dat burgerschapskennis inderdaad zowel conventionele als onconventionele vormen van politieke participatie voorspelt. Het kan echter zijn dat hier mogelijk een effect gemeten is van het algemene onderwijsniveau in plaats van specifiek burgerschapskennis, aangezien onderwijs in het algemeen de kennis vergroot, de politieke interesse en zelfvertrouwen beïnvloedt en uiteindelijk politieke participatie stimuleert (Persson, 2015). Tegelijkertijd is de rol van opleidingsniveau onduidelijk, omdat het ofwel een directe oorzaak kan zijn voor politieke participatie, of het kan dienen als een graadmeter voor andere factoren, zoals de sociaaleconomische status van het gezin, politieke socialisatie, persoonlijkheidstype of het algemeen cognitief niveau (Kam & Palmer, 2008; Persson, 2015). Het verschil tussen leerlingen in opleidingsniveau kan dus verband houden met verschillende vormen van politieke socialisatie — niet alleen op scholen maar ook in andere sociale structuren en relaties, zoals hun familie en leeftijdsgenoten, de verenigingen waar ze deel van uitmaken of in hoeverre ze media gebruiken om zichzelf te informeren (e.g., Campbell, 2009; Persson, 2011).

De voorspellende waarde van socialisatie-ervaringen

In hoofdstuk 4 kwam de volgende onderzoeksvraag aan de orde: *In hoeverre wordt de maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen voorspeld door hun socialisatie-ervaringen tijdens de adolescentie?* Als relevante socialisatie-ervaringen in hun familie en hun vriendengroep is gebruik gemaakt van de mate waarin adolescenten met hun ouders en vrienden over politieke en maatschappelijke onderwerpen praten. Socialisatie-ervaringen via media en vrijwilligersverenigingen zijn gemeten aan de hand van het gebruik van media om informatie over maatschappelijke en politieke kwesties te vergaren als 14-jarigen, en aan de hand van hun zelf gerapporteerde betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersverenigingen.

Op basis van het longitudinale paneldesign met data uit de Nederlandse deelsteekproef in ICCS 2009 en de vervolgstudie van 2016 onder 134 jongvolwassenen, is het effect van socialisatie-ervaringen op conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie verkend met behulp van een multivariate multiple regressieanalyse, hierbij controlerend voor effecten van relevante achtergrondkenmerken van adolescenten en de perceptie van adolescenten van het klasklimaat op school. De analyses lieten geen statistisch significante relaties zien tussen de eerder beschreven

socialisatie-ervaringen tijdens de adolescentie en hun politieke participatie zeven jaar later. Bevindingen uit eerdere studies die erop wezen dat politieke discussies met ouders en vrienden, betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersverenigingen en mediagebruik de politieke participatie van adolescenten en jongvolwassenen beïnvloedden, werden in onze studie niet bevestigd (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011, Ekström & Östman, 2013; Leyva, 2017; Neundorf et al., 2016; Quintelier, 2013).

Wat betreft het praten over politiek met vrienden in de vroege adolescentie, werd echter wel een moderatie-effect van opleidingsniveau gevonden voor conventionele politieke participatie. Adolescenten in het vmbo die met vrienden politieke en maatschappelijke kwesties bespraken, waren als jongvolwassenen minder betrokken bij conventionele politieke activiteiten dan adolescenten in het vwo die hierover met vrienden spraken. Dit kan erop duiden dat er andere mechanismen spelen voor vmbo- en vwo-leerlingen. Een mogelijke verklaring zou kunnen zijn dat in discussies van vmbo-leerlingen frustraties of gebrek aan vertrouwen worden geuit, wat kan leiden tot afwijzing van politieke instituties, terwijl discussies van vwo-leerlingen constructiever van aard zijn – en daarmee hun bereidheid tot latere politieke activiteiten niet worden belemmerd (vgl. Dahl et al., 2018; Glasford, 2008).

De voorspellende waarde van onderwijsprestaties

Hoofdstuk 5 ging in op de onderzoeksvraag: *In hoeverre wordt de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen voorspeld door hun onderwijsprestaties op de middelbare school?* In dit hoofdstuk is de relatie tussen de eindexamencijfers Nederlands, Engels en wiskunde en conventionele en onconventionele politieke en maatschappelijke participatie nagegaan. Data van 111 Nederlandse adolescenten in de schooltypen havo en vwo, die deelnamen aan ICCS 2009 (14-jarige leerlingen) en de tweede dataverzameling in 2016 (21-jarigen) zijn gebruikt. Deze studie bevatte aanvullende gegevens van het CBS over de onderwijsprestaties van leerlingen (d.w.z. centraal eindexamencijfers van drie verplichte kernvakken) om hun relatie met deelname aan de samenleving te beoordelen met behulp van een multivariate multiple regressieanalyse.

De resultaten toonden aan dat, na te hebben gecontroleerd voor effecten van relevante achtergrondkenmerken en burgerschapscompetenties, betere prestaties in één van deze vakken niet gerelateerd was aan zowel de conventionele als de onconventionele politieke participatie drie jaar later. Bovendien wees de studie niet op een significante relatie tussen de prestaties van adolescenten (17- en 18-jarigen)

op Engels en Nederlands en maatschappelijke participatie op jongvolwassen leeftijd, maar adolescenten met een hogere wiskundeprestatie deden wel meer aan maatschappelijke participatie als jongvolwassenen. Dit zou kunnen suggereren dat deze adolescenten met een hoger wiskundecijfer kiezen voor studies in het hoger onderwijs die meer mogelijkheden bieden om maatschappelijk actief te worden, of dat dit de meer bekwame studenten zijn waardoor ze minder moeite hoeven te doen voor hun studie, waardoor ze meer tijd krijgen om deel te nemen aan maatschappelijke activiteiten.

Belangrijkste bevindingen

Dit proefschrift laat zien dat burgerschapskennis van 14-jarige adolescenten zowel hun conventionele als onconventionele politieke participatie op latere leeftijd voorspelt (Hoofdstuk 3). Deze bevinding impliceert indirect dat scholen kunnen bijdragen aan de actieve deelname van burgers aan de samenleving door het bevorderen van burgerschaps-kennis, als onderdeel van burgerschapsonderwijs, onder de assumptie dat scholen de ontwikkeling van burgerschapscompetenties positief beïnvloeden. Uit eerder reviewonderzoek is gebleken dat scholen de burgerschapskennis van leerlingen kunnen bevorderen door zowel het schoolcurriculum als het pedagogische klimaat (Geboers et al., 2013).

Het gebrek aan bewijs voor het verband tussen de politieke attitudes van adolescenten, politieke socialisatie buiten de school (Hoofdstuk 4) en hun deelname aan de samenleving als jongvolwassenen, kan te wijten zijn aan de geringe stabiliteit van politieke attitudes op veertienjarige leeftijd (zie Niemi & Hepburn, 1995) in combinatie met het grote tijdsverschil tussen de metingen in dit panelonderzoek. Eerdere onderzoeken geven aan dat mensen een stabiele houding of overtuiging krijgen wanneer ze zich zorgen maken over – of wanneer ze juist vertrouwd zijn met – politieke kwesties (Converse, 1964; Sears & Levy, 2003). Het meten van politieke attitudes op latere leeftijd zou mogelijk andere uitkomsten hebben opgeleverd, omdat met name in de midden- en late adolescentie (15 tot 18 jaar – ‘de beïnvloedbare jaren’) mensen het meest vatbaar zijn voor politieke invloeden (Eckstein et al., 2012; Sears & Brown, 2013). Mogelijk schuilt hierin de reden dat in dit onderzoek geen duidelijk verband is gevonden tussen burgerschapshoudingen op 14-jarige leeftijd en latere politieke en maatschappelijke participatie (zie Hooghe & Wilkenfeld, 2008). Dergelijke verbanden zijn wel gevonden in studies naar de politieke attitudes in de latere adolescentie, wanneer politiek zelfvertrouwen en interesse meer zijn ontwikkeld (Neundorff et al., 2013; Wittebrood, 1995).

De studies in dit proefschrift konden niet overtuigend aantonen dat de deelname van jongvolwassenen aan politieke en maatschappelijke activiteiten samenhangt met hun eerdere onderwijsprestaties. Echter, adolescenten uit verschillende onderwijsniveaus verschillen wel wat betreft hun politieke participatie – hoewel deze verschillen vooral te vinden waren tussen het vmbo en het vwo (Hoofdstuk 4), en niet tussen havo en vwo (Hoofdstuk 5). Deze bevindingen bevestigen de conclusies van eerdere, ook internationale, onderzoeken dat leerlingen in het voorbereidend hoger onderwijs over het algemeen meer worden aangemoedigd om deel te nemen aan politieke activiteiten dan leerlingen in het beroepsgerichte onderwijs (Janmaat et al., 2014; Netjeset al., 2011; Quintelier, 2010). De mechanismen die deze verschillen kunnen verklaren zijn tot op heden nauwelijks bestudeerd. Eerder onderzoek lijkt te suggereren dat in het vmbo minder aandacht wordt besteed aan burgerschapscompetenties die zouden moeten bevorderen dat leerlingen politiek actief worden, en dat het onderwijs in het vmbo meer gericht is op het aanleren van sociale competenties, zoals zelfvertrouwen, zelfrespect en elementaire regels voor sociale interactie (ten Dam & Volman, 2003; Leenders et al., 2008).

Dit proefschrift voegt een aantal zaken toe aan de huidige kennisbasis omtrent burgerschapsonderwijs. Anders dan bestaande studies maakt dit onderzoek gebruik van een longitudinale perspectief van omstreeks zeven jaar om de effecten van burgerschapscompetenties in de adolescentie op de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen na te gaan. Voorgaand onderzoek is vooral cross-sectioneel van aard, of hanteert een longitudinaal design met een veel kortere tijdsspanne van rond de twee tot drie jaar. In deze onderzoeken werden positieve relaties gevonden tussen burgerschapscompetenties en participatie (Cohen & Chaffee, 2012; Manganelli et al., 2014; Pasek et al., 2008; Quintelier & Hooghe, 2011), maar het was niet duidelijk of deze relaties op de langere termijn stand houden, en daarmee of burgerschapskennis en -oriëntaties in de vroege adolescentie politieke en maatschappelijke activiteiten op latere leeftijd voorspellen (zie Krampen, 1999).

Een tweede belangrijke toevoeging die dit proefschrift levert aan de kennisbasis over burgerschapseffecten is het gebruik van daadwerkelijke participatie als uitkomstmaat in plaats van de intentie om te participeren. De bevindingen met betrekking tot de burgerschapscompetenties van adolescenten en hun politieke en maatschappelijke participatie als jongvolwassenen staan in contrast met de bevindingen van de meeste onderzoeken onder adolescenten, die

gebaseerd zijn op één meetmoment (Gainous & Martens, 2012; Isac et al., 2013; Kahne & Sporte, 2008). Dat zou er op kunnen wijzen dat de voorgenomen politieke participatie bijvoorbeeld eerder de positieve of negatieve houding van een adolescent ten opzichte van politiek weerspiegelt dan hun daadwerkelijke intentie om deel te nemen aan politieke activiteiten. De noodzaak om daadwerkelijke politieke en maatschappelijke participatie als uitkomstmaat te gebruiken om de impact van burgerschapsonderwijs te beoordelen, wordt ondersteund door andere longitudinale studies naar politieke en maatschappelijke participatie (Keating & Janmaat, 2016; Neundorff et al., 2016).

Daarnaast is een meerwaarde van dit proefschrift dat de relatie van zowel burgerschapscompetenties, de invloed van ouders, leeftijdsgenoten en media als de leerprestaties aan het einde van het voortgezet onderwijs op participatie in de jongvolwassenheid zijn onderzocht (vgl. Kam & Palmer, 2008; Persson, 2014). Hiermee is de impact van alternatieve verklaringen op politieke en maatschappelijke participatie onderzocht. Bovendien zijn voor leerprestaties aan het einde van de het voortgezet onderwijs de feitelijke behaalde cijfers op de nationale examens gebruikt voor drie verschillende vakken: Engels, Nederlands en wiskunde.

Tenslotte ondersteunt dit proefschrift toekomstig onderzoek naar politieke participatie van jongvolwassenen door de ontwikkeling van een instrument voor conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie. Met name onconventionele politieke activiteiten zijn de afgelopen decennia populair geworden onder jongvolwassenen (Pilkington & Pollock, 2015; Stockemer & Carbonetti, 2010; Stolle et al., 2005; Zukin et al., 2006). Deze activiteiten zijn niet alleen minder tijdrovend, omdat het doorgaans minder moeite kost de activiteiten uit te voeren, maar ook voor iedereen toegankelijk (Marien et al., 2010). Deze activiteiten richten de aandacht vooral op specifieke vraagstukken en beleidskwesties (Norris, 2003), zoals klimaatverandering, lhbt-rechten, racisme en wereldwijde armoede. De instrumenten die tot nu toe gebruikt werden in onderzoek naar politieke participatie misten vooral een uitwerking van politieke activiteiten die via internet en sociale media aangewend worden.

Beperkingen van het onderzoek

De studies in dit proefschrift kennen een aantal beperkingen. De relatief kleine steekproefomvang was in alle empirische hoofdstukken een punt van zorg. In hoofdstuk 3 is een spaarzaam model met de belangrijkste burgerschapscompetenties gepresenteerd en is vervolgens een positieve relatie tussen de steun van

adolescenten voor democratische waarden en onconventionele politieke participatie gevonden, terwijl deze relatie in het volledige model niet significant bleek. Dit kan worden veroorzaakt door een gebrek aan statistische ‘power’ in het volledige model. Bij de oorspronkelijke onderzoeksopzet van de studie is ingezet op een grotere steekproef van ongeveer 500 jongvolwassenen. Echter, het opsporen van jongvolwassenen na het verlaten van de middelbare school bleek erg moeilijk. Ondanks deze moeilijkheden lijkt het benaderen van respondenten uit eerdere grootschalige studies een veelbelovende exercitie voor toekomstig onderzoek, met name om de langetermijneffecten van onderwijsinterventies te bestuderen. Het wordt daarom aanbevolen om leerlingen vooraf toestemming te vragen om hun gegevens te gebruiken voor toekomstig onderzoek. De mogelijkheden die het nieuwe ‘Nationaal Cohortonderzoek Onderwijs’ (NCO) biedt om oud-leerlingen gemakkelijker te volgen op basis van hun leerlingnummer en om gegevens van grootschalige internationale studies te combineren met registerdata, zullen mogelijk een deel van de moeilijkheden waarmee dit project is geconfronteerd in de toekomst kunnen voorkomen.

Voor de tweede dataverzamelingsronde (gebruikt in Hoofdstuk 3, 4 en 5) is geen volledig representatieve steekproef van Nederlandse jongvolwassenen gerealiseerd. In de definitieve steekproef hadden de respondenten een hogere sociaaleconomische status en waren de hogere opleidingsniveaus oververtegenwoordigd in vergelijking met de oorspronkelijke steekproef van ICCS 2009. Voor de havo en vwo-respondenten (Hoofdstuk 5) week de gerealiseerde steekproef echter niet sterk af van de oorspronkelijke steekproef. Door het ontbreken van een representatieve steekproef van jongvolwassenen, is de kwantificering van hun politieke en maatschappelijke participatie vermeden. Aangezien het doel was om de relaties tussen verschillende voorspellers en de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen te bestuderen, vormde het gebrek aan representatieve gegevens niet noodzakelijkerwijs een probleem. Er waren geen aanwijzingen dat de huidige steekproef een serieuze vertekening veroorzaakte bij het schatten van de relatie tussen burgerschapscompetenties, socialisatie-ervaringen of onderwijsprestaties enerzijds en de deelname van jongvolwassenen aan de samenleving anderzijds.

Een tussenmeting in de late adolescentie zou een interessante toevoeging kunnen zijn geweest, waarmee eventuele effecten van het onderwijsaanbod, zoals het vak Maatschappijleer, en andere maatschappelijke en politieke activiteiten en ervaringen in de bovenbouw van het voortgezet onderwijs (denk aan

scholierenverkiezingen of de maatschappelijke stage) verkend hadden kunnen worden. Aangezien jongvolwassenen tegenwoordig tot op latere leeftijd met een opleiding bezig zijn, en daardoor later een volwaardige baan vinden (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Garcia-Albacete, 2014), kan het interessant zijn de jongvolwassenen langer te volgen. Het kan heel goed dat jongvolwassenen pas wanneer zij een vaste woonplaats en een baan hebben gevonden, hun focus verbreden en maatschappelijk en politiek actief worden (vgl. Nie et al., 1996). Een toekomstige longitudinale panelstudie met twee of meer metingen in de vroege en late adolescentie, en twee metingen in de volwassenheid, zou ons meer inzicht kunnen geven in de aanwezigheid en stabiliteit van attitudes en eventuele langdurige relaties, aangezien de politieke socialisatie en de ontwikkeling van politieke oriëntaties begint in de kindertijd, zich ontwikkelt in de vroege en late adolescentie en met name tot uiting komt gedurende de volwassenheid (Sears & Brown, 2013). Het kernonderzoek van de Langlopende Internet Studies voor de Sociale wetenschappen (LISS) is een goed uitgangspunt qua vormgeving en inhoud. Het LISS-panel bestaat in principe uit Nederlandse huishoudens, van 16 jaar en ouder. Om de geschetste ontwikkeling van politieke oriëntaties in kaart te brengen zouden de thuiswonende jonge adolescenten uit deze huishoudens benaderd kunnen worden.

Implicaties voor de onderwijspraktijk en nader onderzoek

Dit proefschrift maakt de complexiteit van het voorspellen van de politieke en maatschappelijke participatie van jongvolwassenen duidelijk. Effecten van de socialisatie van adolescenten, door discussies over maatschappelijke kwesties met ouders en vrienden, maar ook door media of vrijwilligersverenigingen waarbij ze betrokken zijn, werden niet gevonden. Het onderzoek toonde eveneens geen effecten aan van onderwijsprestaties op de politieke participatie van jongvolwassenen.

Bij de conceptualisering van politieke participatie werd een onderscheid gemaakt tussen conventionele en onconventionele politieke participatie. Deze twee schalen combineren zowel online als offline politieke activiteiten. Hoewel in eerdere studies uitgegaan wordt van een onderscheid tussen online en offline vormen van politieke participatie (Bakker & de Vreese, 2011; Vissers & Stolle, 2014), lijken de grenzen tussen deze vormen minder scherp dan de betreffende studies suggereren. Bovendien staat de afbakening van online politieke participatie nog ter discussie. Critici melden bijvoorbeeld dat het classificeren van online activiteiten op sociale netwerksites als vormen van politieke participatie dubbelzinnig is, aangezien het doel of de bedoeling van deze activiteiten moeilijk te beoordelen

is (Hosch-Dayican, 2014). Zijn bijvoorbeeld reguliere online activiteiten, zoals het delen van een politieke boodschap van een vriend op sociale media of het online bekijken van een politieke gebeurtenis via de livestream van Facebook, politieke participatie? Aangezien sommige van deze activiteiten politiek georiënteerd zijn, terwijl andere dat niet zijn, vormt het meten van politieke participatie een uitdaging voor verder onderzoek naar politieke participatie (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018).

Sociale media bereiken jongeren die niet eerder actief waren, en hebben de potentie om ze te mobiliseren (Vissers & Stolle, 2014). Afgaande op recente wereldwijde demonstraties tegen racisme en klimaatverandering, zijn een deel van de jongeren die hun bezorgd bezorgdheid uiten over deze thema's online gemobiliseerd. De media-aandacht voor deze maatschappelijke vraagstukken biedt docenten in ieder geval ook de mogelijkheid om hun leerlingen kennis te laten maken met burgerschapsthema's, zoals diversiteit, duurzaamheid en solidariteit. Deze thema's worden de komende jaren ook onderdeel van het curriculum in zowel het basis- als het voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland, gezien de werkzaamheden omtrent de herziening van het curriculum, en de uitwerking van het wetsvoorstel ter verduidelijking van de burgerschapsopdracht aan scholen. Leraren kunnen een belangrijke rol spelen bij burgerschapsvorming in het motiveren van hun leerlingen, zodat ze later betrokken blijven bij maatschappelijke en politieke activiteiten (Jacobsen & Casalaspi, 2016; Wanders, 2019).

In dit proefschrift werden burgerschapskennis en steun voor democratische waarden geïdentificeerd als belangrijke voorspellers van politieke participatie. Eerdere reviewstudies suggereren dat een formeel curriculum voor burgerschapsonderwijs een belangrijke rol speelt bij de ontwikkeling van burgerschapscompetenties, met name voor burgerschapskennis (Geboers et al., 2013; Isac et al., 2013) en politieke participatie (Manning & Edwards, 2014). In het burgerschapsonderwijs lijkt wat betreft de vorming van politieke en maatschappelijke attitudes sprake van een afname bij 14- en 15-jarigen (Geboers et al., 2015; Keating et al., 2010). Isac (2015) gaf aan dat, hoewel haar resultaten ook waren gebaseerd op uitkomsten van 14-jarigen, scholen nauwelijks een rol spelen bij de verwerving van niet-cognitieve uitkomsten van leerlingen, zoals burgerschapsattitudes, waarden en intenties tot participatie. Bovendien vond zij dat de verschillen tussen scholen ten aanzien van attitudes, waarden en intenties van adolescenten klein zijn. Gezien onze resultaten lijkt de voorspellende rol van politieke attitudes voor politieke en maatschappelijke participatie in de jongvolwassenheid gering, en daarmee bieden onze resultaten geen concrete aanwijzingen voor scholen om zich op de

ontwikkeling van politieke en maatschappelijke attitudes te richten. Een focus op het vergroten van de burgerschapskennis van leerlingen, gezien de relatie met politieke participatie in jongvolwassenheid, lijkt een meer belovende aanzet om verder te gaan.

Concluderend, dit proefschrift levert empirisch bewijs dat adolescenten met meer burgerschapskennis vaker deelnemen aan conventionele en onconventionele politieke activiteiten als jongvolwassenen. Ervan uitgaande dat scholen bijdragen aan de burgerschapskennis van hun leerlingen, lijkt de school een rol te kunnen spelen bij het aanwakken van politieke participatie. Aangezien het huidige democratisch stelsel ondenkbaar is zonder de politieke participatie van burgers – en ouders, leeftijdsgenoten, de media en vrijwilligersverenigingen slechts een bescheiden rol lijken te hebben op de politieke participatie op de langere termijn – onderstrepen de resultaten van dit proefschrift het mogelijke belang om burgerschapsonderwijs op te nemen in het kerncurriculum van Nederlandse scholen.

References

- Adler, R. P., & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by 'civic engagement'? *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(3), 236–253. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1541344605276792>.
- Albacete, G. G. (2014). *Young people's political participation in Western Europe: Continuity or generational change?* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Albanesi, C., Zani, B., & Cicognani, E. (2012). Youth civic and political participation through the lens of gender: The Italian case. *Human Affairs*, 22(3), 360–374. <http://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0030-3>
- Alejandro Perez, S., & Lautenbach, H. (2018). NEETs: jongeren die geen opleiding volgen en niet werken. *Over.Werk. Tijdschrift van het Steunpunt Werk*, 28(2), 119–126.
- Amnå, E. (2012). How is civic engagement developed over time? Emerging answers from a multidisciplinary field. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 611–27. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.04.011
- Amnå, E., & Ekman, J. (2013). Standby citizens: diverse faces of political passivity. *European Political Science Review*, 6(2), 261–281. doi:10.1017/S175577391300009.
- Amnå, E. & Zetterberg, P. (2010). A political science perspective on socialization research: young Nordic citizens in a comparative light. In L. R. Sherrod, C. A. Flanagan and J. Torney-Purta (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (pp. 43–66). New York: Wiley
- Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., Zukin, C., & Keeter, S. (2003). Habits from home, lessons from school: Influences on youth civic engagement. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 36(2), 275–280.
- Armingeon, K. (2007). Political participation and associational involvement. In J. W. van Deth, J. R. Montero & A. Westholm (Eds.), *Citizenship and involvement in European democracies: A comparative analysis* (pp. 334–357). London: Routledge.
- Bang, H. P., & Sørensen, E. (1999). The Everyday Maker: A new challenge to democratic governance. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 21(3), 325–341, DOI: 10.1080/10841806.1999.11643381
- Bakker, T. P., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Good news for the future? Young people, internet use, and political participation. *Communication Research*, 38(4), 451–470. doi:10.1177/0093650210381738
- Barnes, S., & Kaase, M. (1979). *Political action: Mass participation in five western democracies*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Barrett, M., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2014). Political and civic engagement and participation: Towards an integrative perspective. *Journal of Civil Society*, 10(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2013.871911>
- Barrett, M., & Pachi, D. (2019). *Youth Civic and Political Engagement*. London: Routledge.
- Barrett, M., & Zani, B. (2015). Political and civic engagement: Theoretical understandings, evidence and policies. In M. Barrett & B. Zani (Eds.), *Political and civic engagement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 3–26). New York: Routledge.
- Bengtsson, Å., & Christensen, H. (2014). Ideals and actions: Do citizens' patterns of political participation correspond to their conceptions of democracy? *Government and Opposition*, 1–27. doi:10.1017/gov.2014.29
- Berinsky, A. J. (2004). Can we talk? Self-presentation and the survey response. *Political Psychology*, 25(4), 643–659.
- Biesta, G., Lawy, R., & Kelly, N. (2009). Understanding young people's citizenship learning in everyday life: The role of contexts, relationships and dispositions. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 4, 5–24.
- Bodner, T.E. (2008). What improves with increased missing data imputations? *Structural Equation Modeling*, 15(4), 651–675. doi: 10.1080/10705510802339072

- Bolzendahl, C., & Coffé, H. (2013). Are “good” citizens “good” participants? Testing citizenship norms and political participation across 25 nations. *Political Studies*, 61(SUPPL.1), 63–83. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12010
- Boulianne, S. (2015). Social media use and participation: a meta-analysis of current research. *Information Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524–538. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542
- Boulianne, S., & Theocharis, Y. (2018). Young people, digital media, and engagement: A meta-analysis of research. *Social Science Computer Review*, 38(2), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439318814190>
- Bovens, M., & Wille, A. (2008). Deciphering the Dutch drop: Ten explanations for decreasing political trust in The Netherlands. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 74(2), 283–305. doi:10.1177/0020852308091135
- Bron, J. (2006). *Een basis voor burgerschap: een inhoudelijke verkenning voor het funderend onderwijs*. Enschede: SLO.
- Burden, B. C. (2009). The dynamic effects of education on voter turnout. *Electoral Studies*, 28(4), 540–549. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2009.05.027>
- Cammaerts, B., Bruter, M., Banaji, S., Harrison, S., & Anstead, N. (2013). The myth of youth apathy: Young Europeans’ critical attitudes toward democratic life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58, 645–664. doi:10.1177/0002764213515992
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). What is education’s impact on civic and social engagement? In R. Desjardins and T. Schuller (Eds.), *Measuring the effects of education on health and civic/social engagement* (pp. 25–126). Paris: OECD/CERI.
- Campbell, D. E. (2009). Civic engagement and education: An empirical test of the sorting model. *October*, 53(4), 771–786.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105.
- Castillo, J. C., Miranda, D., Bonhomme, M., Cox, C., & Bascopé, M. (2015). Mitigating the political participation gap from the school: the roles of civic knowledge and classroom climate. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18(1), 16–35. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2014.933199
- Chiessi, M., Cicognani, E., & Sonn, C. (2010). Assessing sense of community on adolescents: Validation the brief scale of sense of community in adolescents (SOC-A). *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(3), 276–292. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop>
- Cho, J., & McLeod, D. M. (2007). Structural antecedents to knowledge and participation: Extending the knowledge gap concept to participation. *Journal of Communication*, 57(2), 205–228. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00340.x
- Cicognani, E., Zani, B., Fournier, B., Gavray, C., & Born, M. (2012). Gender differences in youths’ political engagement and participation. The role of parents and of adolescents’ social and civic participation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 561–576.
- Cohen, A. K., & Chaffee, B. W. (2013). The relationship between adolescents’ civic knowledge, civic attitude, and civic behavior and their self-reported future likelihood of voting. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 8(1), 43–57. doi:10.1177/1746197912456339
- Collins, L. M., Schafer, J. L., & Kam, C. M. (2001). A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 330–51.
- Condon, M. (2015). Voice lessons: Rethinking the relationship between education and political participation. *Political Behavior*, 37(4), 819–843. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-015-9301-0>.

- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. E. Apter (Eds.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 206–261). New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Craig, S. C., Niemi, R. G., & Silver, G. E. (1990). Political efficacy and trust: A report on the NES pilot study items. *Political Behavior*, 12(3), 289–314. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992337>
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, V., Amnå, E., Banaji, S., Landberg, M., Šerek, J., Ribeiro, N. ... Zani, B. (2018). Apathy or alienation? Political passivity among youths across eight European Union countries, *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 15(3), 284–301. doi: 10.1080/17405629.2017.1404985
- Dalton, R. J., (2004). *Democratic challenges, democratic choices: the erosion of political support in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008a). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008b). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x
- Dassonneville, R. (2011). Electoral volatility, political sophistication, trust and efficacy: A study on changes in voter preferences during the Belgian regional elections of 2009. *Acta Politica*, 47(1), 18–41. <http://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2011.19>
- Dassonneville, R., Quintelier, E., Hooghe, M., & Claes, E. (2012). The relation between civic education and political attitudes and behavior: A two-year panel study among Belgian late adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 16(3), 140–150. doi:10.1080/10888691.2012.695265
- de Groot, A. D. (1972). *Methodologie*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton.
- de Leeuw, E. D., Hox, J. J., & Huisman, M. (2003). Prevention and treatment of item nonresponse. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 19, 153–176.
- de Zúñiga, H. G., Veenstra, A., Vraga, E., & Shah, D. (2010). Digital democracy: Reimagining pathways to political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 7(1), 36–51.
- Deary, I. J., Batty, G. D., & Gale, C. R. (2008). Childhood intelligence predicts voter turnout, voting preferences, and political involvement in adulthood: The 1970 British Cohort Study. *Intelligence*, 36(6), 548–555. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2008.09.001>
- Dee, T. S. (2004). Are there civic returns to education? *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9–10), 1697–1720. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.11.002>
- Denny, K., & Doyle, O. (2008). Political interest, cognitive ability and personality: Determinants of voter turnout in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), 291–310. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S000712340800015X>
- Dostie-Goulet, E. (2009). Social networks and the development of political interest. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12(4), 405–421.
- Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2012). Attitudes toward political engagement and willingness to participate in politics: trajectories throughout adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 485–95. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.07.002
- Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2013). Predictors of intentions to participate in politics and actual political behaviors in young adulthood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 37(5), 428–435. doi:10.1177/0165025413486419

- Eidhof, B. B. F., ten Dam, G. T. M., Dijkstra, A. B., & van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2016). Youth citizenship at the end of primary school: the role of language ability. *Research Papers in Education*, 32(2), 217–230. doi: 10.1080/02671522.2016.1167235
- Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, 22(3), 283–300. <http://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1>
- Ekström, M., & Östman, J. (2013). Family talk, peer talk and young people's civic orientation. *European Journal of Communication*, 28(3), 294–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0267323113475410>
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2017). *Citizenship education at school in Europe - 2017. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from https://eurydice.org/pl/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Citizenship_Study_EN_2017.pdf
- Eurydice (2012). *Citizenship education in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Fieldhouse, E., Tranmer, M., & Russell, A. (2007). Something about young people or something about elections? Electoral participation of young people in Europe: Evidence from a multilevel analysis of the European Social Survey. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(6), 797–822.
- Finkel, S. E., & Ernst, H. R. (2005). Civic education in post-apartheid South Africa: Alternative paths to the development of political knowledge and democratic values. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 333–364. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00421.x
- Finlay, A. K., & Flanagan, C. (2013). Adolescents' civic engagement and alcohol use: Longitudinal evidence for patterns of engagement and use in the adults lives of a British cohort. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(3), 435–446. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.01.006.
- Flanagan, C., & Levine, P. (2010). Civic engagement and the transition to adulthood. *Future of Children*, 20(1), 159–179.
- Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(1), 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.51.1.115>
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(4), 698–713. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.42.4.698
- Gainous, J., & Martens, A. M. (2011). The effectiveness of civic education: Are “good” teachers actually good for “all” students? *American Politics Research*, 40(2), 232–266. doi:10.1177/1532673X11419492
- Gaiser, W., de Rijke, J., & Spannring, R. (2010). Youth and political participation - empirical results for Germany within a European context. *Young*, 18(4), 427–450. doi:10.1177/110330881001800404
- Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217–234.
- Ganzeboom, H. B. G., de Graaf, P., & Treiman, D. J. (1992). A standard international socio-economic index of occupational status. *Social Science Research*, 21, 1–56.
- Geboers, E., Geijssels, F., Admiraal, W., & ten Dam, G. (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 158–173. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2012.02.001>
- Geboers, E., Geijssels, F., Admiraal, W., Jorgensen, T., & ten Dam, G. (2015). Citizenship development of adolescents during the lower grades of secondary education. *Journal of Adolescence*, 45, 89–97.
- Gibson, R., & Cantijoch, M. (2013). Conceptualizing and measuring participation in the age of the internet: Is online political engagement really different to offline? *The Journal of Politics*, 75(3), 701–716. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613000431>

- Gillespie, M., Tenverger, E. M., & Kingma, J. (1987). Using Mokken scale analysis to develop unidimensional scales. *Quantity and Quality*, 21(4), 393–408. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00172565>.
- Glanville, J. L. (1999). Political socialization or selection? Adolescent extracurricular participation and political activity in early adulthood. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(2), 279–290.
- Glasford, D. E. (2008). Predicting voting behavior of young adults: The importance of information, motivation, and behavioral skills. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2648–2672. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00408.x
- Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 549–576. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085530>
- Harris, A., Wyn, J., & Younes, S. (2010). Beyond apathetic or activist youth: “Ordinary” young people and contemporary forms of participation. *Young*, 18(1), 9–32. doi:10.1177/110330880901800103
- Hart, D., Donnelly, T. M., Youniss, J., & Atkins, R. (2007). High school community service as a predictor of adult voting and volunteering. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), 197–219. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831206298173>
- Hauser, S. M. (2000). Education, ability, and civic engagement in the contemporary United States. *Social Science Research*, 29(4), 556–582. <http://doi.org/10.1006/ssre.2000.0681>
- Hemker, B. T., Sijtsma, K., & Molenaar, I. W. (1995). Selection of unidimensional scales from a multidimensional item bank in the polytomous Mokken IRT model. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 19(4), 337–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662169501900404>
- Henn, M., & Foard, N. (2012). Young people, political participation and trust in Britain. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 65, 47–67.
- Henn, M., & Foard, N. (2013). Social differentiation in young people’s political participation: The impact of social and educational factors on youth political engagement in Britain. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(3), 360–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.830704>
- Henn, M., Weinstein, M., & Forrest, S. (2005). Uninterested youth? Young people’s attitudes towards party politics in Britain. *Political Studies*, 53, 556–578.
- Henn, M., Weinstein, M., & Wring, D. (2002). A generation apart? Youth and political participation in Britain. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 4(2), 167–192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-856X.t01-1-00001>
- Hillygus, S. D. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior*, 27(1), 25–47. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-005-3075-8>
- Hirzalla, F., & Zoonen, L. V. (2010). Beyond the online/offline divide: How youth’s online and offline civic activities converge. *Social Science Computer Review*, 29(4), 481–498. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0894439310385538>
- Holt, K., Shehata, A., Strömbäck, J., & Ljungberg, E. (2013). Age and the effects of news media attention and social media use on political interest and participation: Do social media function as leveller? *European Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 19–34. doi:10.1177/0267323112465369
- Hooghe, M. (2004). Political socialization and the future of politics. *Acta Politica*, 39(4), 331–341.
- Hooghe, M., & Boonen, J. (2015). The intergenerational transmission of voting intentions in a multiparty setting: An analysis of voting intentions and political discussion among 15-year-old adolescents and their parents in Belgium. *Youth & Society*, 47(1), 125–147. doi:10.1177/0044118x13496826
- Hooghe, M., Dassonneville, R., & Marien, S. (2015). The impact of education on the development of political trust: Results from a five year panel study among late adolescents and young adults in Belgium. *Political Studies*, 63(1), 123–141.

- Hooghe, M., & Oser, J. (2015). The rise of engaged citizenship: The evolution of citizenship norms among adolescents in 21 countries between 1999 and 2009. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 56(1), 29–52. doi:10.1177/0020715215578488
- Hooghe, M., & Wilkenfeld, B. (2008). The stability of political attitudes and behaviors across adolescence and early adulthood: A comparison of survey data on adolescents and young adults in eight countries. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(2), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9199-x>
- Hoskins, B. (2006). *A framework for the creation of indicators on active citizenship and education and training for active citizenship*. Ispra: Joint Research Centre.
- Hoskins, B., & Janmaat, J. G. (2016). Educational trajectories and inequalities of political engagement among adolescents in England. *Social Science Research*, 56, 73–89.
- Hoskins, B., & Mascherini, M. (2009). Measuring active citizenship through the development of a composite indicator. *Journal of Social Indicator Research*, 90(3), 459–488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9271-2>
- Hoskins, B., Villalba, E., van Nijlen, D. & Barber, C. (2008). *Measuring civic competence in Europe*. Ispra: European Commission Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen.
- Howard, M., Gibson, J., & Stolle, D. (2007). *The U.S. Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy Survey (CID)*. Washington, DC: Center for Democracy and Civil Society (CDACS), Georgetown University.
- Howard, M., & Gilbert, L. (2008). A cross-national comparison of the internal effects of participation in voluntary organizations. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 12–32. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00715.x>
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Inspectorate of Education (2018). *Summary Report. The State of Education*. Netherlands Inspectorate of Education: Xerox/OBT.
- Inglehart, R., & Catterberg, G. (2002). Trends in Political Action: The Developmental Trend and the Post-Honeymoon Decline. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 43(3–5), 300–316.
- Isac, M. M. (2015). *Effective civic and citizenship education. A cross-cultural perspective*. (PhD-dissertation) Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Isac, M. M., Maslowski, R., Creemers, B., & van der Werf, G. (2013). The contribution of schooling to secondary-school students' citizenship outcomes across countries. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(1), 29–63. doi:10.1080/09243453.2012.751035
- Janmaat, J. G. (2011). Ability grouping , segregation and civic competences among adolescents. *International Sociology*, 26(4) 455–482.
- Jekielek, S., & Brown, B. (2005). *The transition to adulthood: characteristics of young adults ages 18 to 24 in America*. Washington: Child Trend.
- Jenkins, K., Andolina, M. W., Keeter, S., & Zukin, C. (2003). *Is civic behavior political? Exploring the multidimensional nature of political participation*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. (1981). *Generations and politics: A panel study of young adults and their parents*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, L. (2004). Social trust and civic engagement across time and generations. *Acta Politica*, 39(4), 342–379. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500077

- Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782–799. doi:10.1017/S0022381609090719
- Junker, B. W., & Sijtsma, K. (2001). Nonparametric item response theory in action: An overview of the special issue. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25(3), 211–220. https://doi.org/10.1177/01466210122032028
- Kahne, J., Crow, D., & Lee, N. J. (2013). Different pedagogy, different politics: High school learning opportunities and youth political engagement. *Political Psychology*, 34(3), 419–441. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00936.x
- Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 738–766. doi:10.3102/0002831208316951
- Kam, C. D., & Palmer, C. L. (2008). Reconsidering the effects of education on political participation. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(3), 612–631. doi:10.1017/S0022381608080651
- Kam, C. D., & Palmer, C. L. (2011). Rejoinder: Reinvestigating the causal relationship between higher education and political participation. *Journal of Politics*, 73, 659–63.
- Keating, A., Benton, T., & Kerr, D. (2011). Tracing the trend and transitions in young people's citizenship practices: what are the implications for researching citizenship and citizenship education. *Educational Research*, 53(2), 223–235.
- Keating, A., & Janmaat, J. G. (2015). Education through citizenship at school: Do school activities have a lasting impact on youth political engagement? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 1–21. doi:10.1093/pa/gsv017
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E., & Lopes, J. (2010). *Citizenship education in England 2001–2010: Young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)* (Research Report DFE-RR059). London: Department for Education.
- Keating, A., & Melis, G. (2017). Social media and youth political engagement: Preaching to the converted or providing a new voice for youth? *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 19(4), 877–894. doi:10.1177/1369148117718461
- Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002a). *Improving the measurement of political participation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002b). *The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait*. Retrieved from www.civicyouth.org/research/products/data.htm
- Kim, Y., Russo, S., & Amna, E. (2017). The longitudinal relation between online and offline political participation among youth at two different developmental stages. *New Media & Society*, 1–19. doi:10.1177/1461444815624181
- Kimberlee, R. H. (2002). Why don't British young people vote at general elections? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 5(1), 85–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13676260120111788
- Klausch, T., Hox, J. J., & Schouten, B. (2013). Measurement effects of survey mode on the equivalence of attitudinal rating scale questions. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 42(3), 227–263. doi:10.1177/0049124113500480
- Klofstad, C. A. (2009). Civic talk and civic participation: The moderating effect of individual predispositions. *American Politics Research*, 37, 856–878. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532673X09333960.

- Krampen, G. (2000). Transition of adolescent political action orientations to voting Behavior in early adulthood in view of a social-cognitive action theory model of Personality. *Political Psychology*, 21(2), 277–299. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00188
- Lamprianou I. (2013). Contemporary political participation research: A critical assessment. In K. Demetriou (Eds.), *Democracy in Transition* (pp. 21–42). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30068-4_2
- Leenders, H., Veugelaers, W., & de Kat, E. (2008). Teachers' views on citizenship education in secondary education in The Netherlands. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 38(2), 155–170. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057640802063106>
- Leyva, R. (2017). Exploring UK millennials' social media consumption patterns and participation in elections, activism, and "slacktivism". *Social Science Computer Review*, 35(4), 462–479.
- Li, Y., & Marsh, D. (2008). New forms of political participation: Searching for expert citizens and everyday makers. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), 247–272. doi:10.1017/S0007123408000136
- Linssen, R., Schmeets, H., Scheepers, P., & te Grotenhuis, M. (2014). Trends in conventional and unconventional political participation in Europe, 1981–2008. In C. Eder, I. C. Mochmann & M. Quandt (Eds.), *Political trust and disenchantment with politics* (pp. 31–58). Leiden: Brill.
- Lopes, J., Benton, T., & Cleaver, E. (2009). Young people's intended civic and political participation: does education matter? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12(1), 1–20. doi:10.1080/13676260802191920
- Lopez, M. H., Levine, P., Both, D., Kiesa, A., Kirby, E., & Marcelo, K. (2006). *The 2006 civic and political health of the nation: A detailed look at how youth participate in politics and communities*. College Park, MD: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Manning, N., & Edwards, K. (2014a). Does civic education for young people increase political participation? A systematic review. *Educational Review*, 66, 22–45. doi:10.1080/00131911.2013.763767
- Manning N., & Edwards, K. (2014b). Why has civic education failed to increase young people's political participation? *Sociological Research Online*, 19(1), 1–12.
- Marien, S., Hooghe, M., & Quintelier, E. (2010). Inequalities in non-institutionalised forms of political participation: A multi-level analysis of 25 countries. *Political Studies*, 58(1), 187–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2009.00801.x>
- Martin, A. (2012). Political participation among the youth in Australia: Testing Dalton's good citizen thesis. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 211–226.
- Maslowski, R., & van der Werf, G. (2013). The Netherlands. In *ICCS 2009 Encyclopedia: Approaches to civic and citizenship education around the world* (pp. 293–302). Amsterdam: IEA.
- Mayer, A. (2011). Does education increase participation? *Journal of Politics*, 73(3), 633–645.
- McDevitt, M., & Kiouisis, S. (2007). The red and blue and the defiant activist. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(9), 1214–1230. doi:10.1177/0002764207300048
- McFarland, D. A., & Thomas, R. J. (2006). Bowling young: How youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation. *American Sociological Review*, 71(3), 401–425. <http://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100303>
- McIntosh, H., Hart, D., & Youniss, J. (2007). The influence of family political discussion on youth civic development: Which parent qualities matter? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(3), 495–499. doi:10.1017/S1049096507070758
- Metz, E. C., & Youniss, J. (2005). Longitudinal gains in civic development through school-based required service. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 413–437. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00424.x>

- Milligan, K., Moretti, E., & Oreopoulos, P. (2004). Does education improve citizenship? Evidence from the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9–10), 1667–1695. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.10.005>
- Miranda, D., Castillo, J. C., & Sandoval-Hernandez, A. (2017). Young citizens participation: Empirical testing of a conceptual model. *Youth & Society*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17741024>
- Molenaar, I.W., & Sijsma, K. (2000). *MSP5 for Windows [software]*. Groningen, The Netherlands: iec ProGAMMA.
- Moeller, J., & de Vreese, C. (2013). The differential role of the media as an agent of political socialization in Europe. *European Journal of Communication*, 28(3), 309–325. doi:10.1177/0267323113482447
- Munniksma, A., Dijkstra, A.B., van der Veen, I., Ledoux, G., van de Werfhorst, H., & ten Dam, G. (2017). *Burgerschap in het voortgezet onderwijs. Nederland in vergelijkend perspectief*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Muthén, L., & Muthén, B. (2012). *Mplus user's guide (seventh edition)*, 1–850. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01711.x
- Neundorff, A., Niemi, R. G., & Smets, K. (2016). The compensation effect of civic education on political engagement: How civics classes make up for missing parental socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 921–949. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9341-0>
- Neundorff, A., & Smets, K. (2017). Political socialization and the making of citizens. *Oxford Handbooks Online*, 1–28. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935307.013.98
- Neundorff, A., Smets, K., & García-Albacete, G. (2013). Homemade citizens: The development of political interest during adolescence and young adulthood. *Acta Politica*, 48(1), 92–116.
- Newton, K., & Giebler, H. (2008). *Patterns of participation: political and social participation in 22 nations* (Paper SP IV 2008–201). Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-197146>
- Newton, K., & Montero, J. R. (2007). Patterns of political and social participation. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald & G. Eva (Eds.), *Measuring attitudes cross-nationally: Lessons from the European Social Survey* (pp. 205–237). London: Sage.
- Niemi, R. G., & Hepburn, M. A. (1995). The rebirth of political socialization. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 24, 7–16.
- Niemi, R. G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nieuwelink, H., ten Dam, G., & Dekker, P. (2018). Adolescent citizenship and educational track: A qualitative study on the development of views on the common good. *Research Papers in Education*, 1–16. doi:10.1080/02671522.2018.1452958
- Norris, P. (2003). Young people and political activism: From the politics of loyalties to the politics of choice? In *Report for the Council of Europe symposium: 'Young people and democratic institutions: From disillusionment to participation'*. Retrieved from <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/COE%20Young%20People%20and%20Political%20Activism.pdf>
- Ogris, G., & Westphal, S. (2005). *Political participation of young people in Europe - development of indicators for comparative research in the European Union*. Retrieved from http://www.sora.at/fileadmin/images/content/Pages/euyoupart_ergebnisse_finalcomparativereport.pdf
- Ohme, J., de Vreese, C. H., & Albæk, E. (2018). From theory to practice: How to apply van Deth's conceptual map in empirical political participation research. *Acta Politica*, 53, 367–390. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-017-0056-y>

- Oser, J., Hooghe, M., & Marien, S. (2012). Is online participation distinct from offline participation? A latent class analysis of participation types and their stratification. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(1), 91–101. doi:10.1177/1065912912436695
- Östman, J. (2013). When private talk becomes public political expression: Examining a practice-field hypothesis of youth political development, *Political Communication*, 30(4), 602–619. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2012.737437
- O'Toole, T. (2015). Beyond crisis narratives: Changing modes and repertoires of political participation among young people. In K. Kallio, S. Mills, & T. Skelton, (Eds.), *Politics, Citizenship and Rights* (pp. 1–15). Singapore: Springer.
- O'Toole, T., Lister, M., Marsh, D., Jones, S., & McDonagh, A. (2003). Tuning out or left out? Participation and non-participation among young people. *Contemporary Politics*, 9(1), 45–61. doi:10.1080/1356977032000072477
- Pancer, S. M., Prarr, M., Hunsberger, B., & Alisar, S. (2007). Community and political involvement in adolescence: What distinguishes the activists from the uninvolved? *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(6), 741–759. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20176>
- Papanastasiou, C., & Koutselini, M. (2003). Developmental model of democratic values and attitudes toward social actions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39(6), 539–549. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2004.07.003
- Parry, G., Moyser, G., & Day, N. (1992). *Political participation in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Developmental Science*, 12(1), 26–37. doi:10.1080/10888690801910526
- Paterson, L. (2009). Civic values and the subject matter of educational courses. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(1), 81–98. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03054980802351801>
- Persson, M. (2012a). Does type of education affect political participation? Results from a panel survey of Swedish adolescents. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35, 198–221.
- Persson, M. (2012b). *Education does not cause political participation: Evidence from British Cohort Studies*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Persson, M. (2014). Classroom climate and political learning: Findings from a Swedish panel study and comparative data. *Political Psychology*, 36, 587–601. doi:10.1111/pops.12179
- Persson, M. (2015). Education and political participation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(3), 689–703. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123413000409>
- Persson, M., & Oscarsson, H. (2010). Did the egalitarian reforms of the Swedish educational system equalise levels of democratic citizenship? *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 33(2), 135–163. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2009.00244.x>
- Plutzer, E. (2004). Becoming a habitual voter: Inertia, resources, and growth in young adulthood. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), 41–56. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055402004227>
- Pontes, A. I., Henn, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Assessing young people's political engagement: A critical and systematic literature review of the instruments used to measure political engagement. *International Politics Review*, 4, 55–72.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of american community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Quintelier, E. (2008). Who is politically active: The athlete, the scouts member or the environmental activist? Young people, voluntary engagement and political participation. *Acta Sociologica*, 51(4), 355–370.
- Quintelier, E. (2010). The effect of schools on political participation: A multilevel logistic analysis. *Research Papers in Education*, 25(2), 137–154. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02671520802524810>
- Quintelier, E. (2013a). Engaging adolescents in politics: The longitudinal effect of political socialization agents. *Youth & Society*, 47(1), 51–69. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13507295>
- Quintelier, E. (2013b). The future of political socialization research: Promising or discouraging? *Politics, Culture and Socialization*, 4(2), 134–145.
- Quintelier, E., & Blais, A. (2016). Intended and reported political participation. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28(1), 117–128. doi:10.1093/ijpor/edv017
- Quintelier, E., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Television and political participation among adolescents: The impact of television viewing, entertainment and information preferences. *Mass Communication and Society*, 14(5), 620–642. doi:10.1080/15205436.2010.530383
- Quintelier, E., & Theocharis, Y. (2013). Online political engagement, Facebook, and personality traits. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(3), 280–290. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0894439312462802>
- Quintelier, E., & van Deth, J. W. (2014). Supporting democracy: Political participation and political attitudes. Exploring causality using panel data. *Political Studies*, 62, 153–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12097>
- Sapiro, V. (2004). Not your parents' political socialization: Introduction for a new generation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 1–23.
- Schmeets, H., & te Riele, S. (2013). Declining social cohesion in The Netherlands? *Social Indicators Research*, 115(2), 791–812. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0234-x>
- Schmidt, J. A., Shumow, L., & Kackar, H. (2006). Adolescents' participation in service activities and its impact on academic, behavioral, and civic outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 127–140. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-006-9119-5>
- Schuitema, J., ten Dam, G., & Veugelers, W. (2008). Teaching strategies for moral education: a review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40(1), 69–89. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00220270701294210>
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., & Fraillon, J. (2011). *ICCS 2009 technical report*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=wolfram_schulz
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., Friedman, T (2017). *Becoming citizens in a changing world. IEA International Civic and Citizenship education Study 2016 International report*. Amsterdam: Springer International Publishing.
- Schyns, P., & Koop, C. (2010). Political distrust and social capital in Europe and the USA. *Social Indicator Research*, 96, 145–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9471-4>
- Sears, D. O., & Levy, S. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jervis (Eds.). *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 60–109). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Serek, J., & Umemura, T. (2015). Changes in late adolescents' voting intentions during the election campaign: Disentangling the effects of political communication with parents, peers and media. *European Journal of Communication*, 30(3), 285–300. doi:10.1177/0267323115577306

- Sijtsma, K., Debets, P., & Molenaar, I. W. (1990). Mokken scale analysis for polychotomous items: Theory, a computer program and an empirical application. *Quality & Quantity*, 24(2), 173–188.
- Sijtsma, K., Emons, W. H. M., Bouwmeester, S., Nyklíček, I., & Roorda, L. D. (2008). Nonparametric IRT analysis of quality-of-life scales and its application to the World Health Organization quality-of-life scale (WHOQOL-Bref). *Quality of Life Research*, 17(2), 275–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-007-9281-6>
- Sijtsma, K., & Molenaar, I. W. (1987). Reliability of test scores in nonparametric item response theory. *Psychometrika*, 52(1), 79–97.
- Sijtsma, K., & Molenaar, I. W. (2002). *Introduction to nonparametric item response theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sloam, J. (2016). Diversity and voice: The political participation of young people in the European Union. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 18, 521–537. doi:10.1177/1369148116647176
- Smith, E. S. (1999). The effects of investments in the social capital of youth on political and civic behavior in young adulthood: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology*, 20, 553–580. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00156
- Spannring, R., Ogris, G., & Gaiser, W. (Ed.). (2008). *Youth and political participation in Europa. Results of the comparative study of EUYOUNGPART*. Opladen, Germany: Budrich.
- Stadelmann-Steffen, I., & Sulzer, L. (2017). Just another brick in the wall? The relationship between classroom-based political education and the political interest of young adults in Switzerland. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6261, 1–24. doi:10.1080/13676261.2017.1395832
- Stockemer, D., & Carbonetti, B. (2010). Why do richer democracies survive? The non-effect of unconventional political participation. *The Social Science Journal*, 47(2), 237–251. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2009.12.005
- Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Shifting inequalities: Patterns of exclusion and inclusion in emerging forms of political participation. *European Societies*, 13(1), 119–142.
- Stolle, D., Hooghe, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the supermarket: Political consumerism as a form of political participation. *International Political Science Review*, 26(3), 245–269. doi:10.1177/0192512105053784
- Swanborn, P. G. (1982). *Schaaltechnieken. Theorie en praktijk van acht eenvoudige procedures*. Meppel/Amsterdam: Boom.
- Talò, C. & Mannarini, T. (2015). Measuring participation: Development and validation the participatory behaviors scale. *Social Indicators Research*, 123(3), 799–816.
- ten Dam, G. T. M., & Volman, M. (2003). A life jacket or an art of living: inequality in social competence education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 33, 117–137.
- Tenn, S. (2007). The effect of education on voter turnout. *Political Analysis*, 15, 446–464. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpm012>
- Teorell, J., Torcal, M., & Montero, J.R. (2007). Political participation: mapping the terrain. In J. W. van Deth, J. R. Montero & A. Westholm (Eds.), *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies: A Comparative Analysis* (pp. 334–357), London: Routledge.
- Theocharis, Y. (2011). Young people, political participation and online postmaterialism in Greece. *New Media & Society*, 13(2), 203–223. doi:10.1177/1461444810370733
- Theocharis, Y. (2015). The conceptualization of digitally networked participation. *Social media + society*, 1(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610140>

- Theocharis, Y., & Quintelier, E. (2014). Stimulating citizenship or expanding entertainment? The effect of Facebook on adolescent participation. *New Media & Society*, 18(5), 817–836. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814549006>
- Theocharis, Y., & van Deth, J. W. (2018a). The continuous expansion of citizen participation: A new taxonomy. *European Political Science Review*, 10(1), 1–24. doi:10.1017/S1755773916000230
- Theocharis, Y., & van Deth, J. W. (2018b). *Political participation in a changing world: Conceptual and empirical challenges in the study of citizen engagement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thomassen, J. (2001). *European Social Survey core questionnaire development - Chapter 5: Opinions about political issues*. London: City University London.
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 203–212. <http://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0604>
- van de Werfhorst, H. (2017). Vocational and academic education and political engagement: the importance of the educational institutional structure. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(1), 111–140.
- van der Meer, T. W. G., & van Ingen, E. J. (2009). Schools of democracy? Disentangling the relationship between civic participation and political action in 17 European countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 48(2), 281–308. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00836.x
- van Deth, J. W. (2014). A conceptual map of political participation. *Acta Politica*, 49(3), 349–367. <http://doi.org/10.1057/ap.2014.6>
- van Goethem, A. A. J., van Hoof, A., van Aken, M. A. G., Orobio de Castro, B., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. W. (2014). Socialising adolescent volunteering: How important are parents and friends? Age dependent effects of parents and friends on adolescents' volunteering behaviours. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35(2), 94–101. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2013.12.003
- van Ingen, E., & van der Meer, T. W. G. (2016). Schools or pools of democracy? A longitudinal test of the relation between civic participation and political socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(1), 83–103. doi:10.1007/s11109-015-9307-7
- van Schuur, W. H. (2003). Mokken Scale Analysis: Between the guttmann scale and parametric item response theory. *Political Analysis*, 11, 139–163.
- van Schuur W. H. (2011). *Ordinal item response theory: Mokken Scale Analysis*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Vecchione, M., & Caprara, G. V. (2009). Personality determinants of political participation: The contribution of traits and self-efficacy beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(4), 487–492. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.021
- Ventura, R. (2001). Family political socialization in multiparty systems. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(6), 666–691. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414001034006004>
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Verhelst, N. D., Glas, C. A. W. and Verstralen, H. H. F. M. (1993). *OPLM: One Parameter Logistic model. Computer program and manual*. Arnhem.
- Veugelaers, W. (2007) Creating critical-democratic citizenship education: empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 37(1), 105–119. doi: 10.1080/03057920601061893

- Vromen, A. (2003). 'People try to put us down...' Participatory citizenship of 'Generation X'. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 38(1), 79–99.
- Wanders, F. H. K. (2019). *The contribution of schools to societal participation of young adults: The role of teachers, parents, and friends in stimulating societal interest and societal involvement during adolescence*. (PhD-dissertation) Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Weinstein, E. C. (2014). The personal is political on social media : Online civic expression patterns and pathways among civically engaged youth. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 210–233.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002237>
- Whiteley, P. (2005). *Citizenship education longitudinal study. Second literature review. Citizenship education: The political science perspective*. Nottingham: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Whiteley, P. F. (2011). Is the party over? The decline of party activism and membership across the democratic world. *Party Politics*, 17(1), 21–44. doi:10.1177/1354068810365505
- Wittebrood, K. (1995). *Politieke socialisatie in Nederland. Een onderzoek naar de verwerving en ontwikkeling van politieke houdingen van havo- en vwo-leerlingen* (PhD-dissertation). Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- Wolfinger, R. E., & Rosenstone, S. J. (1980). *Who votes?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Xenos, M., Vromen, A., & Loader, B. D. (2014). The great equalizer? Patterns of social media use and youth political engagement in three advanced democracies. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(2), 151–167. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2013.871318
- Zaff, J. F., Moore, K. A., Papillo, A. R., & Williams, S. (2003). Implications of extracurricular activity participation during adolescence on positive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 18(6), 599–630. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0743558403254779>
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. X. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.

About the Author

Edwin Slijkhuis (December 17, 1987) was born in Epe, the Netherlands. After obtaining his diploma at Gymnasium Apeldoorn, he moved to Groningen to study Sociology. In 2011, he obtained his Master's degree with a specialization in Crime and Security. Later on, he enrolled in the Master program of Political Sciences in Amsterdam. He received his second Master's degree in 2012. Then, he started his PhD research at the Groningen Institute for Educational Research (GION) of the University of Groningen. During his PhD, he was member of the Educational Committee of the Interuniversity Center for Educational Research (ICO). He was also involved in teaching courses for the Bachelor's and Master's degree in Educational Sciences at the University of Groningen. Edwin is currently working as a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Child Development and Education of the University of Amsterdam, where he is conducting research on citizenship education in the primary school curriculum and citizenship competences of primary school pupils.

Dankwoord

Dit lijkt de uitgelezen plaats een woord van dankbaarheid tot betrokkenen bij dit proefschrift te richten. Hierbij.

Ik ben allereerst bijzonder veel dank verschuldigd aan mijn begeleidingsteam. Roel, heel veel dank voor je no-nonsense mentaliteit en het vertrouwen. Jij wist op de goede momenten mijn project de juiste richting te geven, als het even anders liep dan we vooraf bedacht hadden. Greetje, hartelijk dank dat jij als tweede promotor bij mijn project betrokken was. Op de dag dat ik begon met promoveren werd jij vice-decaan van de faculteit GMW. Heel fijn dat je op gezette tijden erbij was. Ik heb erg geprofiteerd van je kritische lezen en theoretische overwegingen.

Ralf, bedankt voor je prettige begeleiding vanaf dag één. We hebben vele nuttige bijeenkomsten gehad, maar ook de samenkomsten waar ik minder inhoudelijke zaken te bespreken had, waren zeer plezierig. Ik heb veel respect dat je zo nauw betrokken bleef bij mijn traject toen je bij het SCP in Den Haag ging werken. Jouw inhoudelijk kennis heeft dit proefschrift naar een hoger niveau getild. Anneke, jij sloot iets later aan in het project, maar niet zonder succes. Grote dank voor je scherpe blik, je gedetailleerde opmerkingen en kennis van methoden en analyses. Fijn dat je deur altijd open stond om te sparren.

Daarnaast alle lof voor de studenten en student-assistenten die betrokken zijn geweest bij de zoektocht naar respondenten en het verzamelen van de data. Ellen, Manouk, Tessa, Jorie, Lisanne, Lieke, Anne-Sophie, Tom, Tifenn, Milan, Anne, Lisa, Esther, Berdien, Nicole en Gerda. Dank voor jullie grote hulp. Bij deze wil ik ook mijn dank uitspreken naar de leden van de beoordelingscommissie, prof. dr. Kees Aarts, prof.dr. Ellen Claes en prof.dr. Anne Bert Dijkstra, voor het lezen van mijn proefschrift.

Ook de collega's van het GION wil ik bedanken voor de fijne tijd die ik op de werkvloer heb gehad. Het was prima vertoeven aan de Grote Rozenstraat. Leuk ook om zo'n actieve groep mede-promovendi te hebben. Speciale dank gaat uit naar mijn kamergenoten Sabine, Marinda en Dorinde, ik heb fijn gewerkt met jullie op kantoor. De sjoelcompetitie bracht ons allen naar een hoger niveau. De collega's in de burgerschapsgroep van de Universiteit van Amsterdam wil ik bedanken voor de welkome opname in hun groep tijdens mijn promotietraject, hierdoor had ik geen enkele aarzeling om mij als postdoc bij jullie groep te voegen. De laatste jaren hebben Jochem en Hajo de boel in Groningen opgeleukt, dank voor jullie gezelschap, het paste als een ouwe jas. Erg leuk dat jullie mijn paranimfen zijn.

Niet zelden trok ik de loopschoenen aan om het schrijfwerk te ontvluchten. Fokie en Sybren wil ik als coaches bedanken voor de ondersteuning hierbij. Met een kleine 21.000 kilometer op de teller, kan ik niet zeggen dat ik afgelopen jaren vastgeplakt zat aan mijn bureaustoel. Nu ik op mijn retour ben vanwege een slepende kwetsuur, kan ik wel zeggen dat ik genoten heb van alle mooie prestaties.

Mijn vrienden bedank ik graag voor het broodnodige vertier. Dank ook aan mijn broer Arnout en zus Marjette die de weg voor mij plaveiden op het gebied van sport en studie. Harma, de vormgeving is geheel op jouw conto te schrijven, dank voor dit hele mooie resultaat. Mijn ouders, Annemarie en Henri, ben ik zeer erkentelijk in de ondersteuning die ik heb gehad op alle vlakken, jullie hebben mij altijd 100 procent gesteund in alles wat ik deed. Het ontbrak me aan niets. En tot slot, Paulien. Je moest lijdzaam toezien hoe mijn inefficiënte manier van werken mij zover bracht. Zoals altijd is het toch op zijn pootjes terecht gekomen. Jij bent het lichtend voorbeeld van hoe het beter kan. Bedankt voor al je geduld en steun. Ik kan me geen leven zonder jou voorstellen.

ICO Dissertation Series

In the ICO Dissertation Series dissertations are published of graduate students from faculties and institutes on educational research within the ICO Partner Universities: Eindhoven University of Technology, Leiden University, Maastricht University, Open University of the Netherlands, Radboud University Nijmegen, University of Amsterdam, University of Antwerp, University of Ghent, University of Groningen, University of Twente, Utrecht University, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and Wageningen University, and formerly Tilburg University (until 2002). The University of Groningen, and the Erasmus University Rotterdam have been 'ICO 'Network partner' in 2010 and 2011. From 2012 onwards, these ICO Network partners are full ICO partners, and from that period their dissertations will be added to this dissertation series.

List update February, 2020

- 374. Jansma, D.J. (25-01-2018) *This is wrong, right? The role of moral components in anti- and prosocial behaviour in primary education*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- 375. Okkinga, M. (02-02-2018) *Teaching reading strategies in classrooms- does it work?* Enschede: University of Twente.
- 376. Thomsen, M. (09-02-2018) *Teachers Trust. Measurement, sources and consequences of teacher's interpersonal trust within schools for vocational education and training*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- 377. Van der Wurff, I.S.M. (09-02-2018) *Fatty acids, Cognition, School Performance and Mental Well-Being in Children and Adolescents*. Heerlen: Open University of the Netherlands.
- 378. Raaijmakers, S.F. (16-02-2018) *Improving self-regulated learning: Effects of training and feedback on self-assessment and task-selection accuracy*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- 379. Zhao, X. (07-03-2018) *Classroom assessment in Chinese primary school mathematics education*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- 380. Van Rooij, E.C.M. (15-03-2018) *Secondary school students' university readiness and their transition to university*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- 381. Vanlommel, K. (26-03-2018) *Opening the black box of teacher judgement: the interplay of rational and intuitive processes*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp.
- 382. Boevé, A.J. (14-05-2018), *Implementing Assessment Innovations in Higher Education*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- 383. Wijsman, L.A. (30-05-2018) *Enhancing Performance and Motivation in Lower Secondary Education*. Leiden: Leiden University.
- 384. Vereijken, M.W.C. (22-05-2018) *Student engagement in research in medical education*. Leiden: Leiden University.
- 385. Stollman, S.H.M. (23-05-2018) *Differentiated instruction in practice: A teacher perspective*. Leiden: Leiden University.

386. Faddar, J. (11-06-2018) *School self-evaluation: self-perception or self-deception? Studies on the validity of school self-evaluation results*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp.
387. Geeraerts, K. (25-06-2018) *Dood hout of onaangeboorde expertise? Intergenerationale kennisstromen in schoolteams*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp.
388. Day, I.N.Z. (28-06-2018), *Intermediate assessment in higher education* (Leiden: Leiden University)
389. Huisman, B.A. (12-09-2018) *Peer feedback on academic writing*. Leiden: Leiden University.
390. Van Berg, M. (17-09-2018) *Classroom Formative Assessment. A quest for a practice that enhances students' mathematics performance*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
391. Tran, T.T.Q. (19-09-2018) *Cultural differences in Vietnam : differences in work-related values between Western and Vietnamese culture and cultural awareness at higher education*. Leiden: Leiden University
392. Boelens, R. (27-09-2018) *Studying blended learning designs for hands-on adult learners*. Ghent: Ghent University.
293. Van Laer, S. (4-10-2018) *Supporting learners in control: investigating self-regulated learning in blended learning environments*. Leuven: KU Leuven.
394. Van der Wilt, F.M. (08-10-18) *Being rejected*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
395. Van Riesen, S.A.N. (26-10-2018) *Inquiring the effect of the experiment design tool: whose boat does it float?* Enschede: University of Twente.
396. Walhout, J.H. (26-10-2018) *Learning to organize digital information* Heerlen: Open University of the Netherlands.
397. Gresnigt, R. (08-11-2018) *Integrated curricula: An approach to strengthen Science & Technology in primary education*. Eindhoven: Eindhoven University of Technology.
398. De Vetten, A.J. (21-11-2018) *From sample to population*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
399. Nederhand M.L. (22-11-2018) *Improving Calibration Accuracy Through Performance Feedback*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam.
400. Kippers, W.B. (28-11-2018) *Formative data use in schools. Unraveling the process*. Enschede: University of Twente.
401. Fix, G.M. (20-12-2018) *The football stadium as classroom. Exploring a program for at-risk students in secondary vocational education*. Enschede: University of Twente.
402. Gast, I. (13-12-2018) *Team-Based Professional Development – Possibilities and challenges of collaborative curriculum design in higher education*. Enschede: University of Twente.
403. Wijnen, M. (01-02-2019) *Introduction of problem-based learning at the Erasmus School of Law: Influences on study processes and outcomes*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University Rotterdam
404. Dobbelaer, M.J. (22-02-2019) *The quality and qualities of classroom observation systems*. Enschede: University of Twente
405. Van der Meulen, A.N. (28-02-2019) *Social cognition of children and young adults in context*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
406. Schep, M. (06-03-2019) *Guidance for guiding. Professionalization of guides in museums of art and history*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam
407. Jonker, H.M. (09-04-2019) *Teachers' perceptions of the collaborative design and implementation of flexibility in a blended curriculum*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam
408. Wanders, F. H. K. (03-05-2019). *The contribution of schools to societal participation of young adults: The role of teachers, parents, and friends in stimulating societal interest and societal involvement during adolescence*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam

409. Schrijvers, M.S.T. (03-05-2019) *The story, the self, the other. Developing insight into human nature in the literature classroom*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam
410. Degrande, T. (08-05-2019) *To add or to multiply? An investigation of children's preference for additive or multiplicative relations*. Leuven: KU Leuven.
411. Filius, R.M. (23-05-2019) *Peer feedback to promote deep learning in online education. Unravelling the process*. Utrecht: Utrecht University
412. Woldman, N. (24-05-2019) *Competence development of temporary agency workers*. Wageningen: Wageningen University
413. Donszelman, S. (06-06-2019) *Doeltaal-leertaal didactiek, professionalisering en leereffecten*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
414. Van Oeveren, C.D.P. (12-06-2019) *ITHAKA gaf je de reis*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
415. Agricola, B.T. (21-06-2019) *Who's in control? Finding balance in student-teacher interactions*. Utrecht: Utrecht University
416. Cuyvers, K. (28-08-2019), *Unravelling medical specialists self-regulated learning in the clinical environment*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp
417. Vossen, T.E. (04-09-2019) *Research and design in STEM education*. Leiden: Leiden University
418. Van Kampen, E. (05-09-2019) *What's CLIL about bilingual education?* Leiden: Leiden University
419. Henderikx, M.A. (06-09-2019) *Mind the Gap: Unravelling learner success and behaviour in Massive Open Online Courses*. Heerlen: Open University of the Netherlands
420. Liu, M. (13-09-2019) *Exploring culture-related values in Chinese student teachers' professional self-understanding and teaching experiences*. Utrecht: Utrecht University
421. Sun, X. (13-09-2019) *Teacher-student interpersonal relationships in Chinese secondary education classrooms*. Utrecht: Utrecht University
422. Wu, Q. (02-10-2019) *Making Construct-Irrelevant Variance Relevant: Modelling item position effects and response behaviors on multiple-choice tests*. Leuven: KU Leuven
423. Jansen, R.S. (11-10-2019) *Dealing with autonomy: Self-regulated learning in open online education*. Utrecht: Utrecht University
424. Van Ginkel, S.O. (23-10-2019) *Fostering oral presentation competence in higher education*. Wageningen: Wageningen University
425. Van der Zanden, P. (05-11-2019) *First-year student success at university: Domains, predictors, and preparation in secondary education*. Nijmegen: Radboud University Nijmegen
426. De Bruijn, A.G.M. (14-11-2019) *The brain in motion: Effects of different types of physical activity on primary school children's academic achievement and brain activation*. Groningen: University of Groningen
427. Hopster-Den Otter, D. (28-11-2019) *Formative assessment design: A balancing act*. Enschede: University of Twente
428. Harmsen, R. (10-12-2019) *Let's talk about stress. Beginning secondary school teachers' stress in the context of induction programmes*. Groningen: University of Groningen
429. Post, T. (11-12-2019) *Fostering inquiry-based pedagogy in primary school: a longitudinal study into the effects of a two-year school improvement project*. Enschede: University of Twente
430. Ackermans, K. (20-12-2019) *Designing Video-Enhanced Rubrics to Master Complex Skills*. Heerlen: Open University of the Netherlands