Who crosses the norms? Predictors of the readiness for non-normative political participation

among adolescents

Jan Šerek, Hana Macháčková & Petr Macek

Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

This version is an original submission to the journal with revisions after peer review accepted

by the editor.

Abstract

This study investigated whether adolescents' readiness for non-normative political participation (i.e., readiness to confront social rules for political reasons) was predicted by their interpersonal problems (with parents, teachers, and classmates), low optimism, and political beliefs (political self-efficacy and distrust in public institutions). A structural equation model using two-wave longitudinal data from Czech high school students (N = 768; 54% females; age range at T1 = 14-17, M = 15.97; T2 data collected 1.5 years later) showed that the changes in adolescents' readiness for non-normative participation were predicted by their lower institutional trust. Interpersonal relationships or optimism had no cross-sectional or longitudinal effect on the readiness for non-normative participation. These results suggest that the main source of adolescents' readiness for non-normative political actions lies in their political beliefs, while the effect of adolescents' interpersonal problems is less clear.

Keywords: institutional trust; interpersonal relationships; non-normative political participation; optimism; political self-efficacy.

Who crosses the norms? Predictors of the readiness for non-normative political participation

among adolescents

Adolescence is characterized by the development of political orientation, including attitudes toward political participation (Eckstein, Noack, & Gniewosz, 2012). Political participation can encompass many forms (e.g., Ekman & Amnå, 2012). One line of prior research focused on two specific forms of political participation, normative and non-normative. While normative participation refers to legitimate, socially accepted forms of political expression (e.g., voting), non-normative participation encompasses more radical activities, which include confronting the system, violating social rules, and being potentially violent, such as participating in illegal protests or demonstrations (Glatz & Dahl, 2016; Kuhn, 2004; Saha, 2000; Tausch et al., 2011; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013).

These two forms of participation are not mutually exclusive and they both result from overall participatory tendencies of adolescents. Yet, young people differ in their preferences for types of participation, and prior research raised a question of who would engage in non-normative – that is, confrontational, subversive, or even illegal and violent - activities (Glatz & Dahl, 2016; Norris, Walgrave, van Aelst, 2003). A number of previous studies addressed this question with a specific focus on radical protests and demonstrations, examining the role of contextual factors and collective and inter-group processes (Bernhagen & Marsh, 2007; Cameron & Nickerson, 2009; Klandermans, 2014; Mannarini, Roccato, Fedi, & Rovere, 2009; Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990).

In our study, we adopted a slightly different approach: we examined the individual and relational factors connected to the adolescents' *readiness* for non-normative political participatory activities. Since adolescence is an important period in the formation of political orientations and attitudes (Eckstein et al., 2012), the focus on the process of formation of preferences towards future political actions should contribute to our understanding of political

behavior. Although these preferences do not necessarily determine the actual behavior, there is some evidence that adolescents' readiness for political action is connected to their future participation, as shown, for instance, by longitudinal studies on German young adults (Eckstein, Noack, & Gniewosz, 2013) or Swedish adolescents (Glatz & Dahl, 2016). We believe that by focusing on adolescents' readiness for non-normative participation, we can construct a more complex picture of young people's political preferences, particularly in those contexts where non-normative participation is uncommon, with rare opportunities for young people to actually participate in non-normative political actions.

The Czech Republic, where this study was conducted, represents exactly the type of context in which non-normative participation is rather uncommon. Attitudes of Czech adolescents to political violence, which is dismissed by about 87% of them, and their expected future participation in illegal protests are close to international averages (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). Based on the analyses of protest events and young people's self-reported participation, political activism in the Czech Republic is only rarely radical or challenging the political system (Císař, Navrátil, & Vráblíková, 2011; Šerek, Petrovičová, & Porubanová, 2012). For many young Czech, non-normative participation is one of the least preferred forms of political participation (particularly compared to legal non-institutionalized participation), and it is perceived as both ineffective and ethically questionable by them (Šerek et al., 2012).

In order to provide a deeper understanding of how preferences for non-normative participation are formed, our study examined two presumptions. First, since some non-normative (especially violent) participation could be seen as a form of problem behavior, we asked whether a preference for such activities is connected to youths' problematic development, indicated by poor interpersonal relationships and a negative outlook regarding their future lives. Second, in line with Gamson's (1968) hypothesis, we investigated whether

readiness for non-normative participation is based on adolescents' political beliefs, namely trust in public institutions and political self-efficacy. Moreover, a possible indirect link from problematic development to readiness for non-normative participation via institutional trust was considered.

The role of problematic development

The first presumption considered the possibility that preference for non-normative participation is an outcome of problematic development. Specifically, we examined whether readiness for non-normative participation is linked to a person's poor relationships with parents, teachers, and peers, which indicate adolescents' poor psychological well-being (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Raja, McGee, & Stanton, 1992; Wilkinson, 2004) and are a potential impetus for problem behavior (Dishion, Patterson, Stoolmiller, & Skinner, 1991; Goldstein, Davis-Kean, & Eccles, 2005). Thus, in line with Kuhn's (2004) suggestion, we asked whether adolescents' readiness for non-normative participation is an expression of their problems with family and school. Many prior studies focused on the role of family and peers in youth political participation and attitudes (Dahl & van Zalk, 2014; Quintelier, 2015). For example, a study on German early and middle adolescents showed that authoritarian parenting was positively associated with political alienation (Gniewosz, Noack, & Buhl, 2009). A study on Swedish early and middle adolescents found that an undemocratic and controlling family climate contributed to readiness to use illegal political actions (Glatz & Dahl, 2016). Kuhn's (2004) study showed that German adolescents spending less time with parents were more willing to use violent political action, and Schmid's study (2012) revealed that parents and peers influenced social responsibility and in turn, also illegal or violent actions of 16-year-old Germans. With regard to the school environment, data from Sweden showed that adolescents who perceived their teachers as unfair were more likely to be involved in illegal political activities (Dahl & Stattin, 2016).

Overall, prior findings suggested that the quality of the relationships within families, peer groups and school can be linked to adolescents' non-normative political orientations and behaviors. Based on these studies, we presume that adolescents' interpersonal problems in multiple domains are related to more general negative expectations and behavioral patterns that are extrapolated towards the society, and might results in adolescents' higher readiness for non-normative political participation. For instance, young people experiencing a lack of understanding, extreme control, frequent discord, or conflicts with authorities at home or school, might tend to challenge authorities also outside these contexts. In this sense, Gniewosz and colleagues (2009) proposed that experienced lack of understanding and influence, caused by authoritarian parenting, undermine the development of trust between the individual and the society. Utilizing the reactance theory, Glatz and Dahl (2016) similarly proposed that the perception of controlling environment within undemocratic family can result in broader reactions in the form of readiness to engage in illegal political actions. Thus, considering the substantial role of family, peers and teachers in adolescents' development as well as political behavior, we examined whether those with worsened parent, peer and teacher relationships incline more towards non-normative actions.

Further, considering that poor psychological well-being is associated not only with low quality of social relationships but also with some personal dispositions, we focused on the role of low optimism. Dispositional optimism, that is, the expectancy of positive outcomes for oneself, constitutes a specific psychosocial resource (Taylor & Seeman, 1999). Low optimism indicates adolescents' vulnerability to symptoms of depression and has been found linked with poor psychological (and physical) well-being (Scheier & Carver,1992; Carver & Scheier, 2009). Thus, since low optimism indicates a worsened psychosocial state, we asked whether it is connected with an increased inclination for non-normative activities.

The role of political beliefs

Our second presumption considered the notion that participation in protest activities has become relatively "normalized" in current society (Aelst & Walgrave, 2001; Norris et al., 2005); hence, it is possible that non-normative participation might reflect adolescents' specific political beliefs but not their overall problematic development. According to the classic Gamson's (1968) hypothesis, a preference for non-normative participation stems from a combination of low trust in public institutions and high political self-efficacy. Efficacy beliefs in general have been proposed as a crucial factor that helps to explain both normative and non-normative activities (Caprara et al., 2009; Manganelli, Lucidi, & Alivernini, 2014; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2013; Vecchione & Caprara, 2009). Prior research often took into account group (collective) or external efficacy, which has been linked with increased participation (cf. a meta-analysis by van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008), including also engagement in protests (Mannarini et al., 2009). In our study, we focused on political self-efficacy (i.e. internal political efficacy), defined as "personal beliefs regarding the ability to achieve desired results in the political domain through personal engagement and an efficient use of one's own capacities and resources" (Caprara, Vecchione, Capanna, & Mebane, 2009; p. 1,002). We tested whether political self-efficacy increases readiness for political participation (as shown by Eckstein et al., 2013), and whether this applies for both normative and non-normative actions.

Finally, we focused on the political beliefs in the form of trust in the societal institutions (such as police and government). Trust in political and civic institutions gained research attention as an important factor in political behavior (Levi & Stoker, 2000; Zmerli, Newton, & Montero, 2007). Prior research showed that a lower institutional trust was linked with non-institutionalized (Kaase, 1999) and more radical (Dekker, Koopmans, & van den Broek, 1997) forms of participation among European adults. This could be explained by the perceived unsatisfactory responsiveness by the distrusted socio-political institutions to the

normative actions. Thus, we presume that adolescents who distrust institutions would be more ready to use non-normative actions.

The aim of the study

Overall, we aimed to assess two sets of individual predictors of adolescents' readiness for non-normative political participation: problematic development, indicated by poor interpersonal relationships and low optimism, and political beliefs, represented by low institutional trust and high political self-efficacy. In order to determine which predictors applied specifically to non-normative participation, predictors of the readiness for normative participation were also assessed.

Although we understand adolescents' problematic development and political beliefs as two alternative explanations of the readiness for non-normative participation, they are not mutually independent. In particular, adolescents' intuitional trust can be partially formed by generalizing experiences with authorities in everyday contexts such as school (Amnå & Zetterberg, 2010; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Richardson, 2004) or family (Duke, Skay, Pettingell, & Borowsky, 2009; Šerek & Macek, 2014). Therefore, we also tested whether the presumed effects of adolescents' problematic development were mediated by their lower institutional trust.

Method

Participants and procedure

Longitudinal data were taken from a broader study on Czech adolescents conducted in mid-2014 (T1) and 1.5 years later (T2). A random cluster sampling of high schools was used within four (out of 14) Czech regions. The selection comprised regions that are both under and above the country's average in terms of economic indicators such as gross domestic product per capita or unemployment rate (Czech Statistical Office, 2014a-d). One of the regions includes the second biggest city of the country.

In schools, all ninth and 10th-grade classrooms available at the time were recruited. While 1,137 students participated in the study at T1, 768 participated in the follow-up examination at T2. No differences were present between the students who participated at both times and those who did not participate at T2, in terms of their gender ($\chi^2_1 = 1.73$, p = .19), parental university/college education ($\chi^2_1 = 1.88$, p = .17), and school track ($\chi^2_1 = 0.34$, p = .56).

The present analysis employed data from 768 students who participated at both times. Their age ranged from 14 to 17 at T1 (M=15.97; SD=0.56); 54% were females; 66% came from vocationally-oriented high schools, others were from academically-oriented grammar schools. The proportion of students from vocational high schools, compared to academically-oriented schools in our sample was close to the proportion present in the populations of the given regions (about 70%; Czech Statistical Office, 2014a-d).

Both T1 and T2 data were collected at schools under the supervision of trained administrators. Students completed paper or online questionnaires.

Measures

Readiness for non-normative and normative political participation (T1 and T2). Adolescents were instructed: "Think about your future when you are adult. If you thought something bad was happening in society, you would …" On a four-point scale (1=certainly no; 2=rather no; 3=rather yes; 4=certainly yes), they rated three non-normative ("participate in an illegal demonstration where clashes with police are at stake," "together with others forcibly occupy some administrative or governmental building," "publicly paste posters or write messages on the wall without permission:" α[T1]=.84; α[T2]=.86); and five normative political activities ("vote in an election," "join a political party," "sign a petition," "join a civic organization," "create a blog or a webpage;" α[T1]=.76; α[T2]=.75).

Political self-efficacy (T1). The scale measured the internal aspect of political efficacy (a belief in own ability to participate in politics) related to local politics, which was assumed to be closer than other political levels (e.g., national) to young people's everyday lives. The scale was created based on general guidelines for constructing self-efficacy scales (Bandura, 2006) and other current scales measuring political self-efficacy (Caprara et al., 2009; Sohl & Arensmeier, 2015). Adolescents assessed whether they believed they could carry out four local political activities: "If I wanted, I think I would be able to organize a local demonstration," "negotiate with local politicians," "organize a petition," "lead a group of people that stands up for some local cause" (α=.86). A four-point response scale ranging from "absolutely disagree" (=1) to "absolutely agree" (=4) was employed, *M*=2.30, *SD*=0.75.

Institutional trust (T1). Participants indicated how much they trusted five institutions (national government; local government; courts; police; political parties; α=.76). The response scale ranged from "I completely distrust" (=1) to "I completely trust" (=4), *M*=2.08, *SD*=0.53.

Relationships with parents (T1). An eight-item subscale, Trust, from the Czech adaptation (Širůček & Lacinová, 2008) of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987) was used. The subscale is intended to measure adolescents' perceptions of mutual understanding and respect in their relationship with parents. All items refer to parents, not distinguishing between mothers and fathers. Six items are worded positively, while two item are worded negatively. Sample items are "My parents understand me" or "My parents respect my feelings" (α=.86). A four-point response scale ranged from "absolutely disagree" (=1) to "absolutely agree" (=4), *M*=3.29, *SD*=0.52.

Relationships with teachers and classmates (T1). Three reverse-coded items about teachers ("I feel that some teachers are against me," "I have disputes and troubles with some teachers," "I don't think teachers would help me if I had some problem;" α=.76) and three

items about classmates ("I don't feel well in our classroom," "Some classmates are hostile to me," "I don't get on with most of my classmates;" α=.71) were adapted from a broader Czech measure of classroom climate (Širůček, in press). A response scale ranged from "absolutely disagree" (=1) to "absolutely agree" (=4), for teachers, M=3.02, SD=0.73, for classmates, M=3.26, SD=0.66.

Optimism (T1). We used our six-item Czech translation of the Revised Life Orientation Test (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), measuring individual differences in the tendency to hold positive expectations about the future. The original measure consists of three positively worded, three negatively worded and four filter items that are not used for the evaluation of the scale. In our study, filter items were replaced by items measuring other constructs Sample items are "I'm always optimistic about my future" or "I rarely count on good things happening to me" (six items; α=.76). A response scale ranging from "absolutely disagree" (=1) to "absolutely agree" (=4) was used, M=2.55, SD=0.55.

Data analysis

Structural equation models were estimated using Mplus 7.4. In order to account for the ordinal nature of the items measuring readiness, a weighted least squares estimator with adjusted means and variances (WLSMV) was employed. All predictors measured by five or more items were indicated by three (institutional trust and optimism) or four (relationship with parents) parcels, created using an item-to-construct balance procedure (Little, Cunningham, & Shahar, 2002). Occasional missing values (covariance coverage ranged from 85 to 98%) were treated using a pairwise deletion of missing data.

Overall, a structural model presented in Figure 1 was estimated. Readiness for non-normative and normative participation at T1 and T2 were predicted by six latent predictors and two manifest control variables, which were gender (0=males, 1=females) and school track (0=vocational, 1=academic). To predict changes in the readiness for participation at T2, the

initial levels at T1 were controlled. Correlations between latent predictor variables and

between residuals of participation were allowed in the model. Indicators of readiness for non-

normative and normative participation were understood as ordinal variables, using probit

regressions to estimate their relations with latent variables. Indicators of predictor variables

were treated as continuous.

[Figure 1]

Results

Preliminary analyses

Confirmatory factor analysis showed that readiness for non-normative and normative

activities represented two distinct latent constructs that were measured invariantly across

time. All items were set to have identical factor loadings and inter-correlated residuals from

T1 to T2. With one exception (correlation between voting in an election and signing a

petition), no other residual inter-correlations were allowed. The model had a good fit

(χ^2_{94}=361.65; *CFI*=.97; *RMSEA*=.06); all standardized factor loadings ranged from .45 to .91.

Correlation between readiness for normative and non-normative participation was .52 at T1

and .53 at T2. Both normative (*r*=.48) and non-normative readiness (*r*=.55) were relatively

stable from T1 to T2.

Descriptive statistics of outcome variables are presented in Table 1. Absolute level of

readiness for non-normative participation between T1 and T2 did not change. Readiness for

normative participation slightly increased.

[Table 1]

Predictors of readiness

A model predicting readiness for non-normative and normative participation at T1

and their changes at T2 (see Figure 1) had an acceptable fit (χ^2_{611}=1254.72; *CFI*=.94;

RMSEA=.04). Standardized factor loadings of indicators of all latent predictors ranged from

.47 to .91 (residual correlations between voting and signing a petition were .35 at T1 and .41 at T2). Residual correlations between readiness for non-normative and normative participation were .49 at T1 and .61 at T2. Autoregressive paths from T1 to T2 were .47 for non-normative and .44 for normative participation. Effects of predictor variables in the model are presented in Table 2 and inter-correlations between predictor variables are presented in Table 3.

[Table 2]

[Table 3]

Readiness for non-normative political participation at T1 was predicted by adolescents' higher political self-efficacy and their lower institutional trust. A lower trust in institutions also predicted an increase of non-normative readiness at T2. Readiness for normative participation at T1 was predicted by higher political self-efficacy and weakly by higher optimism. No variable predicted its change at T2.

Regarding control variables, males had a slightly higher readiness for non-normative participation than females. At the same time, students from academic school tracks had a higher readiness for normative participation than students from vocational schools.

Additional analyses

Because institutional trust predicted the readiness for non-normative participation (Table 2), and, at the same time, it correlated with adolescents' relationships and optimism (Table 3), we tested whether institutional trust could serve as a mediator of the effects of problematic development on the readiness for non-normative participation. For this purpose, we estimated our model with directional effects (instead of correlations) from relationships with parents, relationship with teachers, relationship with classmates, and optimism to institutional trust (χ^2_{612}=1242.38; *CFI*=.94; *RMSEA*=.04). Institutional trust was positively predicted by relationship with teachers (β=.28, *p*<.01), but it was not associated with relationship with parents (β=.07, *p*>.01), relationship with classmates (β=-.09, *p*>.01), or

optimism (β=.10, *p*>.01). Bootstrapped unstandardized 99% confidence intervals (1,000 random resamples) showed indirect effects, mediated by institutional trust, from relationship with teachers to readiness at T1 [-0.22, -0.02], readiness at T2 [-0.17, -0.02], and readiness at T2 via readiness at T1 [-0.11, -0.01]. All these indirect effects, however, had small to negligible sizes (βs≤0.06). No indirect effects we found from relationships with parents (to readiness at T1: [-0.05, 0.01], to readiness at T2: [-0.05, 0.01], to readiness at T2 via readiness at T1: [-0.03, 0.01]), relationship with classmates (to readiness at T1: [-0.04, 0.14], to readiness at T2: [-0.03, 0.11], to readiness at T2 via readiness at T1: [-0.02, 0.07]), or optimism (to readiness at T1: [-0.07, 0.01], to readiness at T2: [-0.05, 0.01], to readiness at T2 via readiness at T1: [-0.04, 0.002]).

Discussion

Our study showed that adolescents' readiness to participate in non-normative political activities, that is, to confront social rules for political reasons, was related to their lack of trust in public institutions. On the other hand, there was no substantial relation between adolescents' readiness for non-normative participation and their poor relationships with parents, teachers and classmates, or their low optimism. Thus, it seems that the main source of adolescents' readiness for non-normative political behavior is their negative evaluation of public institutions rather than their individual problematic development. Considering that the distrust in public institutions is based largely on individual perceptions of poor institutional performance (e.g., unfairness or corruption) rather than individual socialization experiences (Mishler & Rose, 2011), our findings are in line with Gamson's (1968) hypothesis. Specifically, a greater sense of political self-efficacy encouraged adolescents' general readiness to participate, and a lower institutional trust channeled the participation towards non-normative actions that typically challenge traditional institutions.

However, the association between institutional trust and readiness for non-normative versus normative participation is not simply linear. While an increasing distrust in institutions might lead to a greater readiness for non-normative political activities, an increasing trust in institutions does not transform into a greater inclination towards normative political actions. It seems that institutional trust motivates adolescents' political activity only negatively: its absence can result in confrontation with untrustworthy institutions such as police. However, institutional trust as such does not motivate political participation that is in line with the rules set by these institutions. Other factors boosting normative participation must be present, such as political self-efficacy or, as proposed by other studies, favorable personality dispositions (Mondak, 2010) or pro-participatory social norms in adolescents' families, peer groups, and schools (Glasford, 2008; Glynn, Huge, & Lunney, 2009). In our study, the role of personality dispositions was partially indicated by the positive association between optimisms and normative participation. At the same time, pro-participatory social norms can be an explanation for the association between academic (versus vocational) school track and normative participation. Specifically, it is probable that students from academically oriented schools have a generally stronger feeling that normative civic participation is appreciated by other people in their homes and schools.

Additionally, our findings suggest that the readiness for non-normative participation is not enhanced by the negative feelings connected to problematic development. No indicator of problematic development, based on relationships with parents, teachers, peers, or low optimism, has been found connected to increased readiness for non-normative participation. In addition, the finding that internal political self-efficacy was positively associated with a greater readiness for non-normative participation further corroborates the idea that readiness for non-normative participation is not an outcome feeling that one is incompetent to participate in normative ways that are in line with social rules. With these findings, we

suggest being careful before concluding that the readiness for non-normative participation is a direct expression of adolescents' problems in their everyday lives.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that problematic individual development could be influential in an indirect way. Adolescents' negative attitudes towards authority or their perceptions of parental over-controlling and undemocratic behavior might be associated with a greater readiness for non-normative participation (Dahl & Stattin, 2016; Glatz & Dahl, 2016), but it is possible that this effect does not occur unless socialization experiences translate into institutional distrust. Our additional analyses suggested the possibility that poor relationships with teachers contributed to a lower institutional trust, which, in turn, led to a greater readiness for non-normative participation. Other indicators of problematic development had no indirect effects, mediated by institutional trust, on the readiness for non-normative participation. Such results seem to cast further doubts on the general role of problematic development in the formation of non-normative political participation. However, it is possible that, in line with the so-called public institutional hypothesis (Amnå & Zetterberg, 2010), individual experiences with school and school authorities might be generalized to adolescents' expectations from other public institutions. Hence, problems with teachers might be one of the factors contributing to the development of low institutional trust, which is related to the readiness for non-normative participation. Limitations to this finding are very small effect sizes of the indirect effects and a two-wave design of this study, which does not allow for a proper test of longitudinal mediation (Cole & Maxwell, 2003). Therefore, using three-wave longitudinal data to test the mediation role of institutional trust would be a useful direction for further studies.

In addition, extreme forms of problematic individual development were not captured by this study. For instance, adolescents' participation in violent and/or illegal non-political activities might have more direct consequences for their willingness to participate in similar

non-normative politically-oriented activities. Hence, although problematic individual development in general does not seem to be a precursor of non-normative political activism, we cannot rule out that extreme forms of developmental problems do serve this role. Besides, it should be taken into account that this study focused on readiness, not actual non-normative participation, in which case the relation with problems at home and school might be more clear-cut.

Results of this study should be interpreted with respect to the context in which the data was collected. By its definition, non-normative participation must be always understood with the background of prevailing social norms. Radical and system-challenging political activism is rather marginal in the Czech Republic (Císař et al., 2011). Even among young generations, there is a tendency to disapprove of non-normative activities and the levels of actual participation in these activities are typically very low (Šerek et al., 2012). Consequently, it is probable that non-normative activism is perceived as the very last option by many young people who aim to participate in politics and the public sphere. Therefore, our results apply mainly to countries and contexts where non-normative participation is perceived rather negatively. However, it is possible that the precursors of non-normative participation are different or operate in different ways in contexts where non-normative participation is more common and has a greater approval by the young generation. For instance, the direct impact of individual problematic development, not confirmed by this study, might be more pronounced in such a context.

Overall, this study suggests that adolescents who express their readiness for participation in political activities by confronting social institutions and violating social rules should not automatically be perceived as "trouble-makers" who are channeling difficulties from other domains of their lives. A more accurate picture is that these young people have confidence in their ability to participate in the society, but are disappointed by the

performance of traditional institutions such as government, police, or courts. This perspective underlines the important role of institutions that are the closest to young people's everyday lives, such as schools or local governments. Since their experiences with these institutions often constitute the first opportunities for young people to become involved in a public sphere, these experiences shape adolescents' further perceptions and expectations. Hence, if the institutions at the local level are respectful and responsive to adolescents' demands, the potential for adolescents' non-normative participation might be considerably reduced. Moreover, schools can have an important part in discussing the role of institutions and in influencing students' views of the effectiveness of participatory activities for addressing important issues in a normative way. Such debates could contribute to creating a more accurate image of the functionality of normative activities in a democratic society.

References

Aelst, P., & Walgrave, S. (2001). Who is that (wo)man in the street? From the normalisation

of protest to the normalisation of the protester. *European Journal of Political Research,*

39, 461-486. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.00582.

Amnå, E., & Zetterberg, P. (2010). A political science perspective on socialization research:

Young Nordic citizens in a comparative light. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C.

A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 43-66).

Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment:

Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence.

Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 427-454. doi:10.1007/BF02202939

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan

(Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information

Age Publishing.

Bernhagen, P., & Marsh, M. (2007). Voting and protesting: explaining citizen participation in

old and new European democracies. *Democratisation, 14*, 44-72. doi:

10.1080/13510340601024298

Cameron, J. E., & Nickerson, S. L. (2009). Predictors of protest among anti-globalization

demonstrators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*, 734-761. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-

1816.2009.00458.x

Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Capanna, C., & Mebane, M. (2009). Perceived political self-

efficacy: Theory, assessment, and applications. *European Journal of Social Psychology,*

39, 1002–1020. doi:10.1002/ejsp.604

Carver, C. S. & Scheier, M. F. (2009). Optimism. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.),

Handbook of individual differences in social behavior (pp. 330-342). London, New

York: Guilford Press.

Císař, O., Vráblíková, K., & Navrátil, J. (2011). Staří, noví, radikální: politický aktivismus v

České republice očima teorie sociálních hnutí [Old, new, radical: Political activism in

the Czech Republic through the prism of Social Movement Theory]. *Sociologický*

časopis/Czech Sociological Review, 1, 137-167.

Cole, D. A., & Maxwell, S. E. (2003). Testing mediational models with longitudinal data:

Questions and tips in the use of structural equation modeling. *Journal of Abnormal*

Psychology, 112, 558-577. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.112.4.558

Czech Statistical Office (2014a). *Statistická ročenka Jihomoravského kraje 2014* [Statistical

Yearbook of the Jihomoravský Region 2014]. Retrieved from

https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/25812320/33010314.pdf/c41fc70e-c164-494b-

8351-f39962b7c7c2?version=1.2

Czech Statistical Office (2014b). *Statistická ročenka Pardubického kraje 2014* [Statistical

Yearbook of the Pardubický Region 2014]. Retrieved from

https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/25851954/33009214.pdf/3f3eb7f7-34f5-476e-

bcae-23bbd8e0b50d?version=1.2.

Czech Statistical Office (2014c). *Statistická ročenka Kraje Vysočina 2014* [Statistical

Yearbook of the Region Vysočina 2014]. Retrieved from

https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/25863193/33009514.pdf/5250afbe-221c-4012-

ba25-6dfdd23f2179?version=1.4.

Czech Statistical Office (2014d). *Statistická ročenka Zlínského kraje 2014* [Statistical

Yearbook of the Zlínský Region 2014]. Retrieved from

https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/25973811/33009814.pdf/c12fa4e9-29ca-4fd9-
a129-c15b1c8e746e?version=1.4

Dahl, V., & Stattin, H. (2016). Beyond the limits: Involvement in illegal political activities.
European Political Science Review, 8, 125-145. doi:10.1017/S1755773914000435

Dahl, V., & van Zalk, M. (2014). Peer networks and the development of illegal political
behavior among adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 24*, 399-409.
doi:10.1111/jora.12072

Dekker, P., Koopmans, R., & van den Broek, A. (1997). Voluntary associations, social
movements and individual political behaviour in Western Europe. In J. W. van Deth
(Ed.), *Private groups and public life: social participation, voluntary associations and
political involvement in representative democracies* (pp. 224-243). London: Routledge.

Dishion, T. J., Patterson, G. R., Stoolmiller, M., & Skinner, M. L. (1991). Family, school, and
behavioral antecedents to early adolescent involvement with antisocial peers.
Developmental psychology, 27, 172-180. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.27.1.172

Duke, N. N., Skay, C. L., Pettingell, S. L., & Borowsky, I. W. (2009). From adolescent
connections to social capital: Predictors of civic engagement in young adulthood.
Journal of Adolescent Health, 44, 161-168. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.07.007

Eckstein, K., Noack, P., & Gniewosz, B. (2012). Attitudes toward political engagement and
willingness to participate in politics: trajectories throughout adolescence. *Journal of
Adolescence, 35*, 485-495. 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*, 428-435. doi:10.1177/0165025413486419

Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new
typology. *Human affairs, 22*, 283-300. doi:10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1

Gamson, W. A. (1968). *Power and discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

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

Glatz, T., & Dahl, V. (2016). The role of family experiences for adolescents' readiness to use and participate in illegal political activity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 40*, 11-20. doi:10.1177/0165025414558854

Glynn, C. J., Huge, M. E., & Lunney, C. A. (2009). The influence of perceived social norms on college students' intention to vote. *Political Communication, 26*, 48-64. doi: 10.1080/10584600802622860

Gniewosz, B., Noack, P., & Buhl, M. (2009). Political alienation in adolescence: Associations with parental role models, parenting styles, and classroom climate. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33*, 337-346. doi: 10.1177/0165025409103137

Goldstein, S. E., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Parents, peers, and problem behavior: A longitudinal investigation of the impact of relationship perceptions and characteristics on the development of adolescent problem behavior. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 401-413. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.41.2.401

Kaase, M. (1999). Interpersonal trust, political trust and non-institutionalised political participation in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, *22*, 1-21. doi:10.1080/01402389908425313

Klandermans, P. G. (2014). Identity politics and politicized identities: Identity processes and the dynamics of protest. *Political Psychology, 35*, 1-22. doi:10.1111/pops.12167

Kuhn, H. P. (2004). Adolescent voting for right-wing extremist parties and readiness to use violence in political action: Parent and peer contexts. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*, 561-581. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.06.009

Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. Ann*ual review of political science, 3*(1), 475-507. doi:doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.475

Little, T.D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*, 151-173. doi:10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1

Manganelli, S., Lucidi, F., & Alivernini, F. (2014). Adolescents' expected civic participation: The role of civic knowledge and efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Adolescence, 37*(5), 632-641. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.05.001

Mannarini, T., Roccato, M., Fedi, A. and Rovere, A. (2009). Six factors fostering protest: Predicting participation in locally unwanted land uses movements. *Political Psychology, 30*, 895–920. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00732.x

Mishler, W., & Rose, R. (2001). What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies. *Comparative Political Studies, 34*, 30-62. doi:10.1177/0010414001034001002

Mondak, J. J. (2010). *Personality and the foundations of political behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P., Walgrave, S., & van Aelst, P. (2005). Who demonstrates? Antistate rebels, conventional participants, or everyone? *Comparative Politics, 37*, 189-205. doi10.2307/20072882

Quintelier, E. (2015). Engaging adolescents in politics: The longitudinal effect of political socialization agents. *Youth & Society, 47*, 51-69. doi:10.1177/0044118x13507295

Raja, S. N., McGee, R., & Stanton, W. R. (1992). Perceived attachments to parents and peers and psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 21*, 471-485. doi:10.1007/BF01537898

Saha, L. J. (2000). Political activism and civic education among Australian secondary school students. *Australian Journal of Education, 44*, 155-174. doi:10.1177/000494410004400205

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 16*, 201-228. doi:10.1007/BF01173489

Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 1063–1078. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1063

Schmid, C. (2012). The value "social responsibility" as a motivating factor for adolescents' readiness to participate in different types of political actions, and its socialization in parent and peer contexts. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 533-547. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.03.009

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.

Šerek, J., & Macek, P. (2014). Antecedents of political trust in adolescence: Cognitive abilities and perceptions of parents. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 35*, 284–293. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2014.05.001

Šerek, J., Petrovičová, Z., & Porubanová-Norquist, M. (2012). *Mladí a nevšední. Studie občanského života mladých lidí z etnických menšin a majority v České republice [The young and the uncommon: Studying civic lives of young people from ethnic minorities and majority in the Czech Republic].* Brno: Masaryk University.

Širůček, J. (in press). *Standardizace baterie sociální klima třídy [Standardization of the battery Classroom Social Climate]*. Praha: Národní ústav pro vzdělávání [National Institute for Education].

Širůček, J., & Lacinová, L. (2008). Relationship with parents from the perspective of attachment theory. In L. Lacinová & S. Ježek (Eds.), *Fifteen-year-olds in Brno: A slice of longitudinal self-reports* (pp. 123-130). Brno: Masaryk University.

Sohl, S., & Arensmeier, C. (2015). The school's role in youths' political efficacy: Can school provide a compensatory boost to students' political efficacy? *Research Papers in Education, 30*, 133–163. doi:10.1080/02671522.2014.908408

Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011). Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 129-148. doi:10.1037/a0022728

Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (1999). Psychosocial resources and the SES-health relationship. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 896*, 210-225. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb08117.x

Torney-Purta, J., Barber, C. H., & Richardson W. K. (2004). Trust in government-related institutions and political engagement among adolescents in six countries. *Acta Politica, 39*, 380-406. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500080

van Stekelenburg, J., & Klandermans, B. (2013). The social psychology of protest. *Current Sociology, 61*, 886-905. doi:10.1177/0011392113479314

van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: a quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological bulletin, 134*, 504-535. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504

Vecchione, M., & Caprara, G. V. (2009). Personality determinants of political participation:

The contribution of traits and self-efficacy beliefs. *Personality and Individual

Differences, 46*, 487-492. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.11.021

Wilkinson, R. B. (2004). The role of parental and peer attachment in the psychological health

and self-esteem of adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33*, 479-493.

doi:10.1023/B:JOYO.0000048063.59425.20

Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a

disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and

Social Psychology, 58*, 994–1003. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.994

Zmerli, S., Newton, K., & Montero, J. R. (2007). Trust in people, confidence in political

institutions, and satisfaction with democracy. In J.W. van Deth, J. R., Montero, & A.

Westholm, (Eds.), *Citizenship and involvement in European democracies: A

comparative analysis* (pp 35-65). London, New York: Routledge.

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the readiness for participation.

	Frequencies (%)							
	T1				T2			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Non-normative participation								
Illegal demonstration	41	31	17	11	39	32	18	11
Occupation of a building	61	27	6	7	60	27	5	8
Illegal posters/messages on the wall	48	34	12	6	50	33	11	7
Normative participation								
Voting in an election*	16	10	37	37	10	8	38	45
Joining a political party*	51	37	9	3	42	42	12	3
Signing a petition*	10	15	47	28	9	12	46	33
Joining a civic organization	29	41	23	8	23	45	26	6
Creating a blog/webpage	38	43	14	5	40	46	11	3

Note. 1=certainly no; 2=rather no; 3=rather yes; 4=certainly yes. * Change from T1 to T2 significant ($p < .01$) based on the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test.

Table 2. Standardized regression coefficients predicting the readiness for participation.

Predictor variables (T1)	Time 1		Time 2	
	Non-normative	Normative	Non-normative	Normative
Political self-efficacy	.34**	.41**	.01	-.02
Institutional trust	-.21**	.05	-.17**	-.07
Relationship with parents	-.07	-.02	-.02	-.01
Relationship with teachers	-.01	.12	-.04	.09
Relationship with classmates	-.09	-.04	.12	.06
Optimism	.06	.13*	.00	.01
Gender (female)	-.14*	.07	-.11*	.01
School track (academic)	-.04	.20**	-.02	.11*

Note. ** p < .001 * p < .01.

Table 3. Correlations between latent predictor variables.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Political self-efficacy					
2. Institutional trust	-.01				
3. Relationship with parents	.00	.14*			
4. Relationship with teachers	-.12*	.28**	.27**		
5. Relationship with classmates	-.01	.10	.25**	.54**	
6. Optimism	.08	.15*	.26**	.23**	.29**

Note. ** p < .001 * p < .01.

Figure 1. Structural equation model predicting readiness for participation. Factor loadings of indicators 1-8 were constrained to be identical between T1 and T2. For the sake of readability, control variables (gender and school track) are not displayed. Regression coefficients are presented in Table 2, and inter-correlations between predictors are presented in Table 3. Non-significant paths (p>0.01) are marked with grey color.