Do parents, school, community, and organizations affect adolescents' civic engagement by shaping their value orientations?
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Main points of our presentation

• importance of value orientations when studying civic engagement in youth

• importance of broader social context
Predictors of civic engagement

environmental influences on various levels
(Bronfenbrenner, 1979)
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All these predictors also associated with development of socially responsible values.
(Pancer & Pratt, 1999; Flanagan et al., 2007; Wilkenfeld, 2009)
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environment >> internalization of values >> engagement
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Two forms of engagement

1. Voluntary work
   will be associated with values - full mediation

2. Engagement in school
   (student committee, school/class council)
   will reflect environmental factors
   (school democracy)
Two historical contexts

Czech Republic in …

1995 - „post-communism“

2010 - standard democratic country, EU member
Participants and procedure

1995
N = 1121
52 % boys
age mean = 16.0, SD = 1.7

2010
N = 976
47 % boys
age mean = 15.4, SD = 1.2

Questionnaire-based self-reports

SEM with dependent dichotomous variables
probit regression coefficients
Mplus: WLSMV estimator
Measurement model - latent variables

Predictors:

Socially responsible parenting (3)

Parents taught me to be perceptive to the feelings and needs of others.

School democracy (3)

Teachers want students to express their own opinions, even if they disagree with teachers.

Community as a caring place (3)

If there is someone in our community with a problem, he may count on the help of the other people.

Mediators:

When you think of your future life, how much is for you personally the following one?

Socially responsible value orientation (3)

to do something to improve community

Materialistic value orientation (3)

to make a lot of money
Measurement model - latent variables

Soc. respon. par. → Soc. resp. values
School dem. → Soc. resp. values
Caring com. → Mater. values

Soc. respon. par. → School dem.
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Measurement model - latent variables

\[ \chi^2_{20} = 299.8 \]
\[ p < .001 \]
\[ CFI = .97 \]
\[ RMSEA = .04 \]
Measurement model - latent variables

Full measurement invariance:
- age groups (CFI = .96; RMSEA = .04)
- gender (CFI = .96; RMSEA = .04)

Almost full measurement invariance:
- generations (CFI = .94; RMSEA = .05)

Groups were comparable
Measurement model - dependent variables

Dependent (YES-NO):

Volunteering

*Do you participate in any voluntary activities?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>72 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School engagement

*Do you participate in a student committee or school (class) council?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>82 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Predicting volunteering

Diagram:
- Social responsibility of parents
- School demographics
- Caring communication
- Social responsibility values
- Material values
- Engaging volunteer
- Engaging in school
1995


Arrows and coefficients:
- Soc. resp. par. to School dem.: .47**
- School dem. to Caring com.: .21**
- Caring com. to Mater. values: .07*
- Mater. values to Soc. resp. values: .22**
- Soc. resp. values to Eng.– volun.: .43**
- Eng.– volun. to Eng.– school: .13**
No change in model fit:

$$\Delta \chi^2 = 3.24, \ p = .33$$

$$\Delta CFI = .00$$

$$\Delta RMSEA = .00$$

$$\Rightarrow$$ Full mediation
1995

Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI

Parents - Soc. resp. values [.15 .29]
School - Soc. resp. values [.04 .17]
Community - Soc. resp. values [.04 .17]
1995

Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI

Parents - Mater. values
[ -0.01, 0.03 ]

School - Mater. values
[ -0.01, 0.03 ]

Community - Mater. values
[ -0.02, 0.01 ]

Soc. resp. par. -> Soc. resp. values
0.47**

School dem. -> Soc. resp. values
0.22**

Caring com. -> Soc. resp. values
0.22**

Mater. values -> Eng. - volun.
0.48**

Mater. values -> Eng. - school
0.12**

Mater. values

Soc. resp. par.

School dem.

Caring com.
Conclusion 1:
Effect of environmental factors on volunteering fully mediated by socially responsible values. Not by materialistic values.
Predicting school engagement

- Social responsibility of parents (Soc. resp. par.)
- School demographics (School dem.)
- Caring community (Caring com.)
- Social values (Soc. resp. values)
- Material values (Mater. values)
- School engagement (Eng.– school)
- Voluntary engagement (Eng.– volun.)

Correlation coefficients:
- .47** between Soc. resp. par. and Soc. resp. values
- .22** between School dem. and Soc. resp. values
- .23** between Caring com. and Mater. values
- .08* between Soc. resp. values and Mater. values
- .07 between Mater. values and Eng.– school
- .48** between Soc. resp. values and Eng.– volun.
- .12** between Mater. values and Eng.– school
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- Mater. values → Eng.– school: -.06
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School dem. → Soc. resp. values
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Soc. resp. values → Eng.– volun.
Soc. resp. values → Eng.– school
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Correlation coefficients:
- Soc. resp. par. → Soc. resp. values: .47**
- School dem. → Soc. resp. values: .22**
- Caring com. → Soc. resp. values: .08*
- Soc. resp. values → Eng.– volun.: .48**
- Soc. resp. values → Eng.– school: .12**
- Mater. values → Eng.– school: -.06
- Soc. resp. par. → Mater. values: .04
- School dem. → Mater. values: .05
- Caring com. → Mater. values: .07
- Mater. values → Eng.– volun.: .12
- Mater. values → Eng.– school: -.01

Notes:
- ** indicates statistical significance at the .01 level.
- * indicates statistical significance at the .05 level.
No change in model fit:
\[ \Delta \chi^2 = 1.32, \ p = .72 \]
\[ \Delta \text{CFI} = +.01 \]
\[ \Delta \text{RMSEA} = .00 \]
1995

Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI

Parents - Soc. resp. values  [-.00  .14]
School - Soc. resp. values    [-.01  .08]
Community - Soc. resp. values [-.01  .08]

Soc. resp. par. → Soc. resp. values
School dem. → Soc. resp. values
Caring com. → Soc. resp. values
Soc. resp. values → Eng.– volun.
Soc. resp. values → Mater. values
Mater. values → Eng.– school
Mater. values → Soc. resp. values
School dem. → Mater. values
Caring com. → Mater. values
Bootstrapped standardized 95% CI

Parents - Mater. values  
[-.01  .02]

School - Mater. values  
[-.01  .02]

Community - Mater. values  
[-.01  .01]

1995
Conclusion 2:
Almost no effect of environmental factors and values on school engagement.
2010

- Soc. resp. par.
- School dem.
- Caring com.
- Eng.– volun.
- Eng.– school
Similar to 1995 except for: community has negative effect.
considerable effect of school democracy emerged
Predicting volunteering

2010
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School dem.  
Caring com.  

Soc. resp. values  
Mater. values  

Eng.– volun.  
Eng.– school

2010

was 0.48** in 1995!
compared to 1995:
parental effect stronger
school effect similar
community effect almost disappeared
positive effect of parenting on materialistic values!
There were not direct effects in 1995.
Model fit dropped:
\[ \Delta \chi^2_3 = 13.91, \ p < .01 \]
\[ \Delta \text{CFI} = .00 \]
\[ \Delta \text{RMSEA} = .00 \]
Soc. resp. par. 
School dem. 
Caring com. 

Soc. resp. values 
Eng.– volun. 

Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI
Parents - Soc. resp. values
[-.17 .29]
School - Soc. resp. values
[-.08 .13]
Community - Soc. resp. values
[-.03 .05]
2010

Soc. resp. par. → Soc. values
School dem. → Soc. values
Caring com. → Soc. values

Soc. values → Mater. values

Mater. values → Eng.– volun.
Community – Mater. values → Mater. values
School – Mater. values → Mater. values
Parents – Mater. values → Mater. values

Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI
Parents - Mater. values: [-.10, .01]
School - Mater. values: [-.02, .03]
Community - Mater. values: [-.02, .04]
Conclusion 3:

No mediation: values almost do not predict volunteering in 2010.

Effect of socially responsible parenting is not mediated.

Those who perceive community as caring do less volunteering.
Predicting school engagement

Soc. resp. par. -> Soc. resp. values
School dem. -> Soc. resp. values
Caring com. -> Mater. values

Soc. resp. values -> Eng. – volun.
Mater. values -> Eng. – school

Correlation coefficients:
- Soc. resp. par. to Soc. resp. values: 0.62**
- Soc. resp. par. to School dem.: 0.28**
- Soc. resp. par. to Caring com.: 0.22*
- School dem. to Soc. resp. values: 0.29**
- School dem. to Caring com.: -0.05
- Caring com. to Mater. values: -0.09*
- Mater. values to Eng. – volun.: 0.10
- Mater. values to Eng. – school: -0.16**
2010

Soc. resp. par. -> Soc. resp. values
School dem. -> Soc. resp. values
Caring com. -> Soc. resp. values
Mater. values -> Eng.– school
Mater. values -> Eng.– volun.
Soc. resp. par. -> School dem.
Soc. resp. par. -> Caring com.
Caring com. -> School dem.

Correlations:
- .17**
- .14
- .09*
- .28**
- .29**
- .05
- .09*
- .02
- .10
- .16**

Note: similar to 1995
there was no direct effect of school democracy in 1995
Model fit dropped:
\[ \Delta x^2_3 = 18.64, \ p < .01 \]
\[ \Delta CFI = .01 \]
\[ \Delta RMSEA = .00 \]
2010

Soc. resp. par. → Soc. resp. values → Eng.– volun. 

School dem. → Soc. resp. values → Eng.– school

Caring com. → Soc. resp. values

Mater. values

Correlations:
- .17**
- .14
- .22*
- .62**
- .28**
- .09*
- .29**
- .05
- .09*
- .12
- .30**
- .01
- .10
- .16**
- .01
- .02
Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI

Parents - Soc. resp. values       [-.27  .28]
School - Soc. resp. values       [-.12  .12]
Community - Soc. resp. values    [-.05  .05]

Parents - Soc. resp. values       [-.27  .28]
School - Soc. resp. values       [-.12  .12]
Community - Soc. resp. values    [-.05  .05]
Bootstrapped standardized 99% CI

- Parents - Mater. values: [-.04, .05]
- School - Mater. values: [-.01, .01]
- Community - Mater. values: [-.02, .02]
Conclusion 4:
No mediation: Values do not predict school engagement.
Considerable direct effect of school democracy.
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students have learned how to utilize school democracy
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What did the results show?

• school engagement (almost) was not associated with values
• school engagement reflected rather the opportunities provided by the school (in 2010)
• in 1995, the effect of environmental factors on volunteering was fully mediated by socially responsible values
• in 2010, volunteering was independent from values
• socially responsible parenting directly predicted volunteering - no adolescents' internalization
• community had negative effect on volunteering

post-revolutionary optimism in 1995 - sense of personal responsibility for the future
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Values can matter...

... but it is essential to take into account specific forms of civic engagement ...

... and broad historical and cultural context.
Thank you for your attention!
serek@fss.muni.cz