RETHINKING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT: EVIDENCE FROM A STUDY OF YOUNG CHILEANS

Neman Garcia, Department of History of Art, University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

Although civic engagement is a multidimensional concept, the low participation of youth in conventional politics is often interpreted as an indicator of low civic engagement. This study questions the centrality of conventional political participation as the main indicator of civic engagement, and assesses whether attention to conventional politics is an indicator of civic engagement among young people. Findings of a logistic regression analysis on a sample of young Chileans (N = 390) classified as: (a) political (N = 279) and (b) apolitical (N = 111) indicated that conventional political participation predicts membership to the political and local participation to the apolitical group. Levels of tolerance, civic competencies, participation in nonconventional politics did not predict group membership. Findings indicate that conventional political participation is not the main indicator of civic engagement, and suggest the need to advance multidimensional models civic engagement beyond conventional politics.

Keywords: civic engagement; conventional politics; logistic regression; youth

---

The findings of studies in various countries show that young people have decreased their conventional political participation compared to previous generations (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; National Youth Institute INJUV, 2004, 2009; Putnam, 1996; Smith, 2005). , one of the dimensions usually considered in the study of civic engagement (Flanagan, Syvertsen, & Stout, 2007; Jenkins,

2005; Putnam, 1996). For Ehrlich (2000) civic engagement consists of working to promote the quality of life of the community through political and non-political processes and involves the development of knowledge (eg, rights), skills (eg, communicating), values (eg, responsibility), and the motivation (eg, political efficacy) that allow us to make this difference.

The emphasis of some research on the behavioral dimension (eg, voting, contacting authorities; eg, Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002; Pattie, Seyd, & Whiteley, 2003; Putnam, 1996, 2000) has limited the understanding of the civic engagement (Zaff, Boyd, Li, Lerner, & Lerner, 2010), since this also refers to civic capabilities and motivations (Amna, 2012; Crocetti, Jahromi, & Meeus, 2012; Zaff, Hart, Flanagan, Youniss, & Levine , 2010). Although civic engagement has been considered multidimensional (Torney-Purta, Amadeo, & Andolina, 2010), few studies have examined the association between levels of attention to conventional politics (eg, voting) with levels in other dimensions of civic engagement. (eg, civic competencies) in attitudinal measures.

According to Ames (2013), young people have been described as apathetic or apolitical due to a lack of civic responsibility inferred from lower electoral participation or ignorance of public affairs (Ekman & Amna, 2012). Political participation describes direct or indirect activities that citizens carry out to influence decisions or the election of rulers (Verba & Nie, 1972) and includes conventional forms (eg, electoral participation, party activism) and unconventional forms (eg, protest activities, contact with authorities) (Teorell, Torcal, & Montero, 2007). Young people's lower interest in conventional political participation has been associated with lower civic engagement (Putnam, 1996, 2000).

According to Ames (2013), the idea of young people who are apolitical or not very committed to society's problems would be rather imprecise because although they may be disappointed or uninformed about political events, they could be interested in the social problems that underlie them. According to Rodríguez (2005), the current participation of young people differs from that of the sixties, which was more ideologized, formalized (eg, political youth, student movements) and motivated by objectives of structural social and political changes in society than today. more informal, more horizontal and with causes more related to daily life (eg, sexual and reproductive rights, freedom of expression). From a broader perspective, Ocampo (2011) suggests that the loss of centrality of the State in contemporary social life and the disenchantment and frustration of young people with respect to political institutions has decreased their interest in issues associated with the State. Specifically, Ocampo, Méndez and Pavajeau (2008) suggest a loss of meaning and meaning of the public, which is manifested in practices of apathy and low participation of citizens in matters that affect them, in practices of political exclusion of some sectors of society. the population, or in the use of public resources for the benefit of particular interests, favoring social phenomena of corruption, impunity and violence.

If currently young people do not share conventional forms of political participation (Martínez, 2010; Sandoval & Hatibovic, 2010), inferring levels of civic engagement from conventional political participation would be a limited way to estimate the civic engagement of young people. According to Amna (2012), civic commitment refers to values, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, knowledge, skills, and behaviors associated with situations outside the sphere of family and friends, which can be expressed with acts in the public, market, civil,

personal, or political. Very few studies, however, have evaluated whether young people who express different degrees of interest or attention to conventional politics as a predictor of political participation (Sabucedo, Durán, Alzate, & Barreto, 2010; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995) present differences in other aspects of civic engagement. Sabucedo's findings*et al.* (2010) show that young people's political identification oriented to right-left ideas is positively associated with interest in participating in politics (eg, $\beta = 0.17$; $p < 0.05$), although they do not consider young people who lack this *identification* or who consider themselves as apolitical (Núñez, Jenaro, Flores, & Guzmán, 2014).

If we then assume that civic engagement includes behaviors (eg, voting), attitudes (eg, civic attention), knowledge (eg, democratic processes) and motivations (eg, political efficacy) (O'Neill, 2007), it is relevant to evaluate whether Different degrees of attention to conventional politics are associated with different levels of civic engagement defined multidimensionally across dimensions such as civic competencies, tolerance, political and civic participation. If the evidence suggests changes in the levels of conventional political participation in young people, can it be inferred that lower participation is associated with lower levels in other civic dimensions? If there is indeed an association between conventional political participation with other dimensions of civic engagement,

The results of representative samples in Chile (INJUV, 2009) indicate that 86% of young people are not interested in voting in political elections, and that 95% would not participate in a political campaign. On the other hand, 55% of young people declare interest in participating in an organization that defends a social cause and 90% consider that young people are an important contribution to society (INJUV, 2009). The above figures suggest that young people are

interested in public affairs despite their lower disposition towards conventional political participation. Indeed, participation in unconventional activities such as volunteering has increased (Flanagan & Levine, 2010) from 4.5% (INJUV, 2004) to 9.9% (INJUV, 2009).

Possible explanations for young people's lower attention to conventional politics are that they would increasingly define their lifestyles based on their own individual decisions (United Nations Development Program UNDP, 2009). Young people would have new ways of connecting with others and with public affairs (Ocampo, 2011; Rodríguez, 2005). Young people would be active in public discussion through the Internet (Shah, Cho, Eveland, & Kwak, 2005; Wyatt, Katz, & Kim, 2000), which would make access to the community more accessible and transparent (Thomlinson, 1999).) by simplifying interpersonal ties (Ng & Detenber, 2005) and facilitating deliberative civic dialogues (Dahlberg, 2001). For Schlegel (2000), young people are part of a global youth culture in which the Internet (56% of young people use it every or almost every day; INJUV, 2009) allows a techno-sociality (Holmes & Rusell, 1999) with new forms of citizen agency, social demands and articulating the collective with the individual (UNDP, 2009). Therefore, future studies of civic engagement in young people should include measures of their attention, information, and civic participation through the Internet (social networks) (Mossberger, Tolbert, & McNeal, 2008).

If the new ways of building social capital through Internet connections with friends, family, social networks and organizations (Wellman, Haase, Witte, & Hampton, 2001) also include direct collaboration with other members of the community (Adler & Goggin, 2005 ; Pleyers, 2004), it would be possible to assume that young people express their civic commitment beyond conventional

political participation (Muxel, 1994, 2001). Evaluate this individual-centered commitment (Crocetti *et al.,* 2012; Zaff *et al.,*2010) should include skills (eg, civic competencies) and attitudes (eg, civic disposition) that are associated with decisions to participate in civic life (Levinson, 2010). For example, for Flanagan and Faison (2001) tolerance is essential in a democratic identity and civic competencies represent the skills necessary to achieve the civic goals of a group of citizens.

The findings of previous studies (Flanagan *et al.,*2007) also suggest that measures of civic engagement should include forms of unconventional activism (Barnes & Kasse, 1979), participation around specific issues (eg, indigenous rights, environmental care) (Krauskopf, 2000) and also the behaviors and civic attitudes with which young people intend to influence decisions on public affairs (Conway, 1990). For example, Haste and Hogan (2006) argue that unconventional politics has gone from having a peripheral to a central role in the functioning of democracies. Thus, estimating young people's civic engagement requires assessing civic behaviors (eg, protesting), civic skills (eg, contacting authorities), civic connections (eg, belonging to civic clubs or associations), and civic responsibilities (eg,*et al.,* 2010).

Change in socialization contexts and ways of becoming an adult

It is also possible to analyze changes in the way in which young people express their civic commitment with respect to their parents' generation (Putnam, 1996) in the context of the transition to adulthood (Flanagan & Levine, 2010). In relation to their parents' generation, current generations have been socialized with different expectations regarding identity construction processes (Arnett, 2000; Lapeyronnie, 2005). Greater elasticity in the transitions to adulthood (Fussell & Furstenberg, 2005) and greater socioeconomic opportunities have

allowed more educated groups (Galambos & Martínez, 2007) or in more developed countries greater heterogeneity in the paths they can choose. (Bendit, Hahn, & Miranda, 2008; Coté & Bynner, 2008) to become adults. In a global context, young people would be interested in topics beyond their local realities (Arnett, 2002) and their values would also be influenced by the prevalence of the market system (Silva & Silva, 2010). For Flanagan (2008), the socialization of young people in the context of the values of neoliberal systems would be associated with more individualistic attitudes, privileging educational achievements to deal with more unstable labor markets.

In summary, the changes in socialization contexts and values would have permeated young people with a global culture (Arnett, 2002) based on individualism, democracy, the free market, individual rights, openness to change and tolerance (Giddens, 2000), and also of a neoliberal political system that would have been consolidated worldwide (Pharr & Putnam, 2000). In this context, the task of committing to a system of values and civic causes that depend on the cultural characteristics of each society and that evolves according to the changes that occur in societies throughout history (Martínez, 2010) and the way in which young people internalize these sociocultural elements to act according to the sociopolitical context in which they live (Ménard, 2010),

Motivations for civic commitment in the construction of youth identities

From a generational perspective (Mannheim, 1952), new ways of expressing civic commitment would be associated with the global environment in which young people build their identity and transition to adult roles (eg, work, marriage) (Flanagan & Tucker, 1999). Flanagan (2008) suggests that awareness of global reach through democratic access to information and participation through the Internet would have created more fluid, flexible and inclusive

political identities in young people. According to Beck (2005), participating in global processes that transcend national sovereignty would make young people's motivations more person-to-world and less citizen-to-nation. Krauskopf (2000) suggests that young people would have a less ideological outlook than their parents and that they would include less universalist themes of social change. Ingram, Gallay, & Gallay 1997; Tucker, 1999). Ingram, Gallay, & Gallay 1997; Tucker, 1999).

The previous findings suggest that studying civic engagement should consider aspects of individual development and the contexts of civic socialization (Flanagan, Martínez, & Cumsille, 2009), questions that have not yet been resolved. For example, Flanagan and Levine (2010) question whether current generations have weaker permanent connections to civic life than previous generations or whether this is due to a longer transition to adulthood due to a shift in the markers of adulthood ((eg, they take longer to marry or finish their education). Assessing civic engagement at the individual level would require evaluating more permanent dimensions of development (eg, attitudes) and perhaps more contextual ones (eg, forms or levels of participation). For Torney-Purta *et al.*(2010) the civic engagement of young people would include participation (not limited to voting), political understanding (not limited to knowledge), attitudes and dispositions (not limited to tolerance) and context (not limited to curricula).

Considering the possible changes in values and socialization contexts described and civic engagement as a multidimensional concept (Amna, 2012; Bobek, Zaff, Li, & Lerner, 2009; O'Neill, 2007; Torney-Purta et al., *2010* ; Zaff *et al,* 2010), this study assumes that the level of attention to conventional politics is a limited indicator of other dimensions of young people's civic engagement

since this includes skills (eg, civic competencies) and beliefs (eg, sense of social justice) that influence civic or political participation (Crocetti *et al.,* 2012; Levinson, 2010)

To contrast this postulate, the study examines whether young people with different degrees of attention to conventional politics, estimated by identification with traditional political ideas (eg, left, right) or non-identification with these ideas (eg, apolitical), also differ in other civic dispositions (eg, towards unconventional political participation, tolerance, towards political or civic participation), civic competencies (eg, contacting authorities) and conceptions of citizenship (eg, responsibility, participation, social justice). If indeed the lower attention of young people towards conventional politics is associated with lower levels of civic engagement, significant differences in civic attitudes would be expected,

That is, if attention to conventional politics as a predictor of political participation is a limited indicator of civic engagement in young people, it is expected (1) that the degree of identification with conventional politics will not be associated with significant differences in levels of tolerance or civic competencies. If civic engagement also includes unconventional political participation and direct collaboration with the community, it is expected (2) that the degree of identification with conventional politics will not be associated with significant differences in the levels of unconventional political participation and participation local. If attention to conventional politics is indeed associated with conventional political participation, It is expected (3) that the highest degree of identification with conventional politics will be associated with significantly higher levels of conventional political participation. Additionally, if there is a wide range of ideas about how to

conceive a good citizen—which can be configured in three ways of expressing citizenship such as (a) responsible personality, (b) participatory and (c) justice-oriented (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004)—it is expected (4) that the degree of identification with conventional politics is associated with different conceptions of citizenship as alternative ways of expressing civic engagement.

Method

Participants

The sample was intentional and is made up of young people ($N = 390$, 42% men, $M_{age} = 20$ years, $SD = 1.79$) recruited from five Chilean universities. Based on their responses to an identification item in the instrument that assessed their different political ideas, participants were assigned to two alternative groups (ie, political or apolitical). Table 1 shows that 72% of the participants were assigned to the political group. 42% of the political group and 9% of the non-political group were registered in the electoral registers (the national average is estimated at 21%; INJUV, 2009). 54% of the participants belong to two universities in Santiago de Chile.

TABLE 1. *Participants' sociodemographic characteristics*

Characteristics		n	%
Gender	Male	736	49.7
	Female	745	50.3
Age (years)	11	2	0.1
	12	248	16.7
	13	341	23.0
	14	373	25.2
	15	369	249
	16	131	8.8
	17	17	1.1
School year	Year 7	376	25.4
	Year 8	356	24.0
	Year 9	367	24.8
	Year 10	382	25.8

Source: own work

Procedure

Educational establishments were contacted for permission to invite their students to voluntarily participate in the study. The objectives and conditions of participation were explained and the participants signed a written consent. A self-report questionnaire was applied in the classrooms by examiners trained for this purpose.

Instrument

The instrument used evaluates the following dimensions:

Identification with political ideas

This dimension was evaluated using an item that allowed each participant to be assigned to the political or apolitical group (eg, considering your political ideas, do you feel closer to?: Left, Center left, Center, Center right, Right, Apolitical). The political group includes those who declare closeness to some political idea (eg, Left, Right) and the apolitical group includes those who declare themselves apolitical.

Tolerance

This scale evaluates the degree to which people accept points of view other than their own or those they consider to be true (Teven, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1998). It is made up of four items (eg, I like to talk to people who have different points of view than mine). The response options range from 1 (Strongly *disagree)* to 5 (Strongly *agree)* and register a Cronbach's alpha reliability index of 0.76.

Civic skills

This scale assesses willingness to social change, activism toward social justice, social roles, and political empowerment (Watts & Flanagan, 2007). It is made up of 8 items (eg, Make a plan to attack the problem). The response options

range from 1 *(Unlikely)* to 4 (Very *Likely)* and registers a Cronbach's alpha reliability index of 0.83.

Sociopolitical attitudes

These dimensions evaluate the disposition towards three general forms of civic participation such as: (a) political participation that represents the activities to elect government leaders; (b) political voice (ie, unconventional political participation) that represents the activities with which individuals express their political opinions; and (c) civic participation that represents voluntary actions organized to solve problems or help others (Jenkins, Andolina, Keeter, & Zukin, 2003). The scale that studies these three dimensions was validated in the sample of 390 young people through an exploratory factor analysis with a method of extraction of principal axes and oblique rotation, according to the criterion of eigenvalues greater than one and the factor loadings of the structure matrix. . This scale answers a question about the willingness to carry out certain civic activities (eg, Think about the next two years of your life, how likely is it that you will do each of the following activities?). Response options range from 1 (*Very unlikely)* to 5 (*Very likely).* These dimensions are represented by three scales:

1. Conventional political participation.

This scale assesses orientation toward political processes (Jenkins, 2005). It is made up of 3 items (eg, voting regularly) and registers a Cronbach's alpha reliability index of 0.74.

2. Unconventional political participation.

This scale assesses orientation toward alternative forms of civic engagement (Flanagan *et al.,* 2007). It is made up of 4 items (eg, joining a cause against a

company or a large company) and registers a Cronbach's alpha reliability index of 0.83.

3. Local participation.

This scale assesses the orientation to collaborate with the community and help other individuals (Haste & Hogan, 2006). It is made up of 3 items (eg, working with a group to solve a problem in the community where you live), and registers a Cronbach's alpha reliability index of 0.80.

Conceptions of citizenship.

This dimension evaluates the different forms of expression of the behavior of a good citizen in a democratic society (Westheimer, 2004). This dimension was evaluated using a scale that answers a question about the definition as a citizen (eg, Of the characteristics described below, which define you as a citizen?) and participants must choose the three items that best represent their concept of citizenship. The scale is composed of 12 items that evaluate three ways of expressing citizenship: 6 items that evaluate responsible citizenship (eg, I follow the rules and laws), 4 items that evaluate participatory citizenship (eg, I express my opinion about social issues or politicians) and 2 items that assess justice-oriented citizenship (eg,

Analysis plan

To contrast the hypotheses of tolerance, civic competences, and sociopolitical attitudes between the political and apolitical groups, a logistic regression analysis was carried out. To test the hypothesis of whether political and apolitical groups have alternative ways of expressing their citizenship, a frequency analysis and a variance analysis were carried out.

Results

Tolerance, civic competencies, and sociopolitical attitudes

Table 2 presents the results of the logistic regression that compares the political and apolitical groups in the three dimensions evaluated, tolerance, civic competences and sociopolitical attitudes.

TABLA 2
Regresión de Tolerancia, Competencias cívicas y Actitudes sociopolíticas

Medida	OR	Wald	p <	I.C. 95.0% para OR	
				Inferior	Superior
Edad	0.947	0.396	0.529	0.800	1.122
Género	1.341	0.939	0.332	0.741	2.427
NSE	1.194	4.287	0.038	1.010	1.412
Tolerancia	0.980	0.008	0.930	0.620	1.547
Competencias cívicas	0.927	0.071	0.790	0.528	1.626
Convencional	2.992	31.413	0.000	2.039	4.389
No convencional	1.072	0.207	0.649	0.793	1.450
Local	0.673	4.874	0.027	0.473	0.957
Constante	0.446	0.129	0.720		

VD = 1 (i.e., grupo político), 0 (i.e., grupo apolítico)

Fuente: elaboración propia

The variables were entered in two blocks. First, the sociodemographic variables (ie, age, gender, socioeconomic level SES) and second, the dimensions of tolerance, civic competencies and sociopolitical attitudes (ie, conventional, unconventional, local). The dependent variable was categorized with the value 1 for the political group correctly classified 98% by the regression and with the value 0 for the apolitical group correctly classified 38%. The results indicate that conventional political activism (OR = 2.992; $p = 0.000$) is a predictor of the political group and local participation (OR = 0.637; $p = 0.027$) is a predictor of the apolitical group. As shown in Table 2The results support the hypotheses about tolerance and civic competencies. The results also support the hypotheses of conventional and unconventional political participation, and do not support that of local participation.

As can be seen in Table 1, the question on political identification allowed us to distinguish two groups of participants. 42% of the participants who identify

with some political idea are registered to vote *versus* 9% of the apolitical group. This result is consistent with those presented in Table 3 regarding significantly higher averages of the political group in formal participation activities such as a traditional political party, student center or student federation and some group that defends an ideal cause. In Table 3different youth activities are presented that respond to a common statement, "Below is a list of organizations. Check which ones you participate in regularly or previously participated in, which ones you would like to participate in, and which ones you are not interested in participating in." The response alternatives ranged from 1 = I actively participate, to 4 = I am not interested in participating. That is, a lower number on the scale represents greater participation.

TABLA 3

Anova de los grupos sobre frecuencia de participación en actividades sociales, cívicas, y políticas

Participación	MA(DE)	MP(DE)	F	Sig.
Club o grupo deportivo	2.47(1.06)	2.55(0.98)	0.502	0.479
Grupo religioso o que cultiva la espiritualidad	2.97(1.12)	2.77(1.06)	2.861	0.092
Centro de alumnos(as) o federación de estudiantes	3.53(0.70)	3.10(0.89)	20.943	0.000
Agrupación de ayuda a los demás (voluntariado, colonias escolares, etc.)	2.90(0.80)	2.79(0.77)	1.463	0.227
Partido político tradicional (juventudes políticas, etc.)	3.92(0.31)	3.54(0.75)	26.242	0.000
Movimiento Guías y Scouts	3.39(0.78)	3.29(0.87)	1.024	0.312
Agrupación o grupo de hobbie o juego (ajedrez, cartas, poker)	3.23(0.90)	3.34(0.89)	1.135	0.287
Organización o agrupación artística y/o cultural (grupo de teatro, grupo de música, banda, grupo de danza, etc.).	2.75(0.84)	2.67(0.84)	0.632	0.427
Comunidad o grupo virtual (grupo de chat, foros, blogs, etc.)	2.67(1.22)	2.67(1.34)	0.001	0.974
Sindicato u organización laboral o profesional	3.56(0.55)	3.43(0.66)	3.196	0.075
Barra de fútbol	3.32(1.04)	3.45(0.94)	1.365	0.243
Organización vecinal u organización comunitaria	3.65(0.61)	3.58(0.63)	0.997	0.319
Colectivo, agrupación o movimiento que defiende una causa o ideal (ecológica, derechos humanos, derechos de la mujer, derechos de las minorías sexuales, etc.)	3.24(0.62)	3.05(0.79)	4.889	0.028
Organización, agrupación o movimiento que lucha por un problema concreto (pase escolar, gratuidad PSU, etc.)	2.96(0.78)	2.89(0.86)	0.586	0.444
Agrupación o tribu que cultiva una identidad (tecno, pokemon, skinhead, gótico, etc.)	3.78(0.64)	3.74(0.74)	0.338	0.561

Nota. Un menor valor en la dimensión representa mayor nivel de participación. MA = Media apolítico, MP = Media político

Fuente: elaboración propia

In Table 3 it can also be seen that the young people from the apolitical group do not present significant differences with respect to the political group in terms of their participation in a group helping others, union or community organization, neighborhood organization or community organizations, organization or group fight for a common problem.

In summary, young people with and without identification with conventional politics represent two groups that differ in their interest in more political activism and that show similar levels of tolerance, civic competencies and non-conventional political participation; they differ in conventional political participation and local participation. .

Conceptions of citizenship

Figure 1 presents the results of the analysis of variance to contrast whether the groups classified as political and apolitical differ in their conceptions of citizenship.

The results of the frequency analysis (ie, percentage of preference for each item) and variance analysis for the twelve citizenship items evaluated indicate that in its conception of citizenship the political group prioritizes formal responsibility (ie, voting regularly; $p = 0.002$) . and political participation (ie, expressing opinions about social and political issues; $p = 0.004$). Although there are no significant differences between the political and apolitical group in other indicators of their conceptions of citizenship, an analysis of variance considering gender indicates that in their conceptions of citizenship, men in the apolitical group prioritize responsibility towards other people (ie, helping those who need it, be considerate of others, $p= 0.037$).

Discussion

As hypothesized, the results of this study indicate a limited association between attention to mainstream politics and other dimensions of civic engagement. The results also indicate that young people with and without identification with conventional politics have similar levels in other dimensions of civic engagement such as civic competencies or tolerance and alternative ways of expressing their citizenship. These findings are consistent with the frequency that young people report getting involved in civic activities such as a neighborhood organization or community organization or a group helping others to a similar degree between both groups and greater participation in student centers or a political party in the political group (eg, Table 3).

Although the local participation hypothesis postulated similarities between the groups, the greater willingness of the apolitical group to collaborate with its immediate community is an indicator of civic commitment in young people who declare themselves indifferent towards conventional politics. This finding shows the need to evaluate civic engagement in a multidimensional way, since young people from the apolitical group would have been classified as not very engaged if only their degree of attention to conventional politics or their conventional political participation were considered to estimate their degree of civic engagement. . If we remember Putnam's (1996) seminal definition, "civic engagement is the connection of people with their community and not only in political aspects" (p. 3). Table 3). If the apolitical group shows similar levels of disposition towards unconventional political participation with the political group, this represents another indicator of civic engagement in young people indifferent towards conventional politics. Haste and Hogan (2006) propose that civic engagement is associated with the maintenance of democracy and those

who most support democracy are also the most willing to protest against authority and question it (Passini & Morselli, 2011).

In addition to highlighting the need to study the civic engagement of young people in a multidimensional way, the study findings show the need to specify the dimensions that comprise it (Bobek *et al.,* 2009; O'Neill, 2007; Zaff *et al.,* 2010) and to specify the object of study of civic engagement (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010; Wilkenfeld, Lauckhardt, & Torney-Purta, 2010). According to the findings of this study, in addition to conventional political participation, it would be necessary to include measures of skills (eg, civic competencies), attitudes (eg, tolerance) and other behavioral measures (eg, unconventional political participation, local participation) to estimate commitment. civic.

The results of the analysis of the conceptions of citizenship indicate that the political group conceives its citizenship as formal participation. The political group shows significantly higher levels both in their willingness to vote and in expressing their opinion on social or political issues. Alternatively, the apolitical group conceives citizenship as responsibility towards its immediate community. Although this study did not consider a gender analysis, the results show that men in the apolitical group present significantly higher levels of willingness to help others. These results suggest that the two groups have their own ways of conceiving citizenship (Ocampo, Méndez, & Pavajeau, 2008) and that they are consistent with previous studies in different populations. For example,

The validity of the findings of this study must be interpreted considering some adjustment limitations of the logistic regression and the response format of the conceptions of citizenship. The inference of greater willingness to local

participation of the apolitical group should be interpreted with caution, since the regression predicts the apolitical group at a medium-low level. The frequency format of the participants' responses used to study their conceptions of citizenship presents limitations since each participant weighs three items of the twelve that the scale has. Future studies should consider the use of a Likert-type scale.

Although conventional political participation is fundamental in the construction of the democratic system, the findings suggest reevaluating its centrality as an indicator of civic engagement in young people. Political participation would be a form more typical of adult participation (O'Neill, 2007; Ocampo, 2011; Rodríguez, 2005) which is evident in the positive correlation between age and participation in conventional politics (Norris, 2003; O' Neill, 2007). The limited capacity of conventional politics as an indicator of civic engagement in young people should motivate research both on the specific predictors of civic or political participation (Sabucedo et al., 2010) of young people and on the indicators that best represent civic engagement (Zaff *et al.,*2010). The degree of consistency between the results of the four hypotheses suggests that future studies estimate what type of relationship exists between civic engagement and alternative ways of conceiving citizenship. This would collaborate with the need to develop a theoretical framework in civic engagement (Wilkenfeld *et al.*, 2010), since different conceptions of citizenship lead to different beliefs regarding the capabilities and ways of engaging that citizens possess (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

References

Adler, R. P. & Goggin, J. (2005). What Do We mean By "Civic Engagement'?" *Journal of Transformative Education,* 3(3), 236-253.

Ames, M. (2013). Engaging "Apolitical" Adolescents: Analyzing the Popularity and Educational Potential of Dystopian Literature Post-9/11. *The High School Journal,* 97(1), 3-20.

Amna, E. (2012). How is civic engagement developed over time? Emerging answers from a multidisciplinary field. *Journal of Adolescence,* 35(3), 611-627.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist,* 55(5), 469-480.

Arnett, J. J. (2002). The Psychology of Globalization. *American Psychologist,* 57(10), 774-783.

Beck, U. (2005). *Power in the global age.* Cambridge, UK, Polity.

Bendit, R., Hahn, M., & Miranda, A. (2008). *Young people and the future. Processes of social inclusion and patterns of vulnerability in a globalized world.* Buenos Aires: Prometeo.

Bobek, D., Zaff, J., Li, Y., & Lerner, R. (2009). Cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of civic action: Towards an integrated measure of civic engagement. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology,* 30, 615-627.

Conway, M. M. (1990). *Political participation in the United States.* New York: Quarterly Press.

Coté, J. E., & Bynner, J. M. (2008). Changes in the transition to adulthood in the UK and Canada: the role of structure and agency in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Youth Studies, 11(3),* 251-268.

Crocetti, E., Jahromi, P., & Meeus, W. (2012). Identity and civic engagement in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 35,* 521-532.

Dahlberg, L. (2001). Computer-mediated communication and the public sphere: A critical analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 7(1).

Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education.* Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Ekman, J., & Amna, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human affairs,* 22(3), 283-300.

Flanagan, C. A. (2008). Private anxieties and public hopes: The perils and promise of youth in the context of globalization. In J. Cole and D. Durham, (Eds.), *Figuring the future: Children, youth, and globalization* (pp. 125-150). Santa Fe, New Mexico: SAR Press.

Flanagan, C. A., & Faison, N. (2001). Youth civic development: implications of research for social policy and programs. In L. Sherrod (Ed.) *Social Policy Report: A Publication for the Society for Research in Child Development* (pp. 3-14). Ann Arbor, MI: Soc. Res. Child Dev.

Flanagan, C. A., Ingram, P., Gallay, E. M.,& Gallay, E. E. (1997). Why are people poor? Social conditions and adolescentsinterpretation of the "social contract." In R. D. Taylor, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), Social and emotional adjustment and family relations in ethnic minority families (pp. 53-62). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flanagan, C. A., & Levine, P. (2010). Civic Engagement and the Transition to Adulthood. *Future of Children,* 20(1), 159-179.

Flanagan, C. A, Martínez, M. L., & Cumsille, P. (2009). Civil societies as cultural and developmental contexts for civic identity formation. In L. Arnett Jensen (Ed.), *Bridging cultural and developmental psychology: New syntheses*

in theory, research and policy (pp. 113 - 37). New York: Oxford University Press.

Flanagan, C. A., Syvertsen, A. K., & Stout, M. D. (2007). *Civic measurement models: Tapping adolescentscivic engagement* (CIRCLE Working Paper, 55). College Park, MD: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Flanagan, C. A., & Tucker, C. J. (1999). Adolescents'explanations for political issues: Concordance with their views of self and Society. *Developmental Psychology, 35*(5), 1198-1209.

Fussell, E., & Furstenberg, F.F. Jr. (2005). The Transition to Adulthood during the Twentieth Century: Race, Nativity, and Gender. In R. A. Settersten Jr., F. F. Furstenberg Jr., & R. Rumbaut (Eds.), *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy* (pp. 29 -75). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Galambos, N. L., & Martínez, M. L. (2007). Poised for emerging adulthood in Latin America: A pleasure for the privileged. *Child Development Perspectives,* 1(2), 109-114.

Giddens, A. (2000). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives.* New York: Routledge.

Haste, H., & Hogan, A. (2006). Beyond conventional civic participation, beyond the moral political divide: Young people and contemporary debates about citizenship. *Journal of Moral Education, 35*(4), 473-493.

Holmes, D., & Russell, G. (1999). Adolescent CIT use: Paradigm shifts for educational and cultural practices? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20*(1), 69-78.

National Youth Institute - INJUV (2004). *Fourth National Youth Survey. The social integration of young people in Chile 1994-2003*. Santiago, Chile: Ministry of Planning and Cooperation.