Civic knowledge and engagement among students from immigrant and non-immigrant backgrounds

Tim Friedman
Australian Council for Educational Research
friedman@acer.edu.au

Wolfram Schulz
Australian Council for Educational Research
schulz@acer.edu.au

Julian Fraillon
Australian Council for Educational Research
fraillon@acer.edu.au

John Ainley
Australian Council for Educational Research
ainley@acer.edu.au

Paper prepared for the 5th IEA International Research Conference in Singapore, 26-28 June 2013.

Abstract

Civic and citizenship education has the goal of preparing young people for their role as citizens in society through the acquisition of civic knowledge and development of positive attitudes toward engagement. However, globalization and higher levels of migration have led to a re-thinking of the way education should be prepared young people for citizenship in an increasingly globalized world which is no longer only defined by notions of nation states. This paper focuses on the relationship between immigrant background and indicators for civic knowledge and engagement. The data used were collected as part of the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS 2009), and includes measures of students' background, civic knowledge, attitudes and behaviors as well as context information about schools and education systems. It will explore to which extent immigrant background influences young people's preparation for citizenship across a diverse range of national contexts.

Introduction

Barriers to mobility between countries are gradually easing, and correspondingly migration rates are increasing in nearly all parts of the world. The approaches countries take to educating their students in the area of civics and citizenship may require a re-thinking in order to accommodate their changing demographics. This paper explores the relationship between immigrant background and indicators of civic knowledge and engagement. The data used for the analysis were collected as part of the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) which was conducted in 38 countries and investigated how young people are prepared to undertake their role as citizens. The survey collected a wide range of student-level data relating to civic knowledge, attitudes and behaviours.

Theoretical Framework

The context in which students develop civic knowledge and dispositions to be engaged as citizens has been impacted by several changes (Osler & Starkey, 2006). In particular there have been increased levels of migration of peoples within and across continents and countries, often driven by economic and political imperatives to find work or escape ethnic, religious, and cultural tension. This has brought challenges concerning equality, equity, diversity, intercultural relations, and community cohesion. With regard to education, the cultural and language background of students has often been found to be associated with their educational performance (see for example, Elley, 1992; Kao, 2004; Kao & Thompson, 2003; Stanat & Christinsen, 2006).

Civic and citizenship education is often incorporated into secondary schooling to develop students as informed and active citizens. Almost all of the 38 participating countries in ICCS 2009 considered their civic and citizenship education policies to be of medium to high priority (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, 2010). These policies typically acknowledge that students' development as citizens is, in part, a function of their experience within their communities. This model of political socialization of young people as citizens underpinned both ICCS 2009 and its precursor CIVED 1999 (Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito & Kerr, 2008). Under this

model, one essential element is whether young people or their parents were born in the country in which they are attending school.

Increasing immigration in many countries presents a challenge to the way that education systems deal with higher level of diversity among young people (Zadja, 2009). Traditionally, the preparation of young people for citizenship has been shaped by notions of a nation state and common citizenship. Whilst some scholars have discussed to which extent civic and citizenship education has taken up broader approaches toward global or supra-national notions of citizenship, there is evidence that most civic-related curricula retain traditional assumptions about nationhood (Kennedy, 2012). ICCS 2009 provides a rich and broad range of data to assess the extent that immigrant background across a diverse range of national contexts is related to students' civic knowledge and engagement and has the potential of providing policy-relevant information on this relationship and its association with different approaches to civic and citizenship education.

Data and Methods

The data from this study were obtained from the ICCS 2009 Main Survey which was carried out in 38 countries between October 2008 and May 2009. In each country approximately 150 schools were sampled depending on characteristics of the education system using PPS (probability proportional to size as measured by the number of students enrolled) sampling procedures. In each school typically one intact class was randomly selected. Student samples per country ranged from 3000 to 5000 students in the target grade. The target grade corresponded to the eighth year of schooling provided that the minimum age of students was 13.5 years.

The following international instruments were administered as part of ICCS 2009:

- The international student test with 80 items in seven different clusters administered in complete rotated design with seven randomly allocated booklets, each consisting of three 15-minutes clusters.
- The international student questionnaire (40 minutes length) which was administered after the international test booklets.
- The international teacher questionnaire contained questions regarding school context, teaching and learning and took about 30 minutes to be completed.
- The international school questionnaire contained questions about school characteristics, school, and community context and took 20-30 minutes to be completed.
- The national contexts questionnaire contained questions related to the structure of the education system, civic and citizenship education in the national curricula and recent developments in civic and citizenship education and was completed by national centre staff in consultation with national experts.

The analyses will use data on immigrant background of the student, sourced from student questionnaire responses to a question about their country of birth and the country of birth of their parents. Students could be categorised as falling into three possible categories: No immigrant background (both student and parents were all born in country of test); student born in country but parents born in country outside of test;

and both student and parents born outside of country of test. In order to ensure there were enough cases for comparative analyses, the last two categories were combined to create a dichotomous variable (no immigrant background '0' v immigrant background '1').

Criterion variables in the analyses included IRC scales based on student questionnaire. These scales reflect intentions to participate in future protests (both legal and illegal), expected participation in electoral, political and informal activities, and also students' sense of citizenship self-efficacy (see Schulz & Friedman, 2011 for more details). Civic knowledge was also used as a dependent variable in the analyses. This IRT Rasch scale was based on 73 out of the 74 multiple choice and all six constructed response test items from the ICCS Student Cognitive test. Plausible values were used as estimates of students' civic knowledge. The scale had a reliability of 0.84 (see details in Schulz & Fraillon, 2011).

To ensure group sizes with sufficient statistical power, only countries that had a minimum of 10 percent of students with an immigrant background were included in the analyses. All reported average scale scores are recorded with their respective standard errors that were estimated using the jackknife replication method (see Schulz, 2011). The analyses of student questionnaire scales include the reporting of averages based on the countries with a minimum of 10 percent of students in each group. Data for Hong Kong SAR and the Netherlands were not included in the tables and are reported separately as these two countries did not meet the sample participation requirements for this study.

Results

Immigration background and civic knowledge score

Table 1 shows group percentages of students from non-immigrant and immigrant backgrounds for each country participating in ICCS that had a minimum of 10 percent of students from an immigrant background (see Schulz et al., 2010, p.195 for percentages for all countries. Civic knowledge scores are presented for each subgroup (where they meet the 10% minimum criteria).

<Insert Table 1 here>

The countries with the highest percentage of students from immigrant backgrounds are Luxembourg, Hong Kong SAR and Liechtenstein (43 percent, 36 percent and 34 percent respectively). At the other end of the scale, there are 14 countries with students from immigrant background only making up less than two percent.

Only 15 out of the 38 countries involved in the study had ten percent or more students from an immigrant background, and subsequent analyses focus on only the data from these countries. Thirteen of these fifteen countries are European, whereas in Asia there is only one participant meeting this criterion (Hong Kong SAR). None of the six Latin American countries had a proportion of students from an immigrant background above 10 percent.

In thirteen of the fifteen countries, students from an immigrant background had (statistically significant) lower civic knowledge scores than students from an immigrant background. Only one country (Hong Kong SAR) had students from an immigrant background which had higher civic knowledge scores than students from a

non-immigrant background. The difference was more than 40 scale points in eleven of the fifteen countries. Immigrant background was only found to explain an average of four percent across countries, with Luxembourg having the highest proportion (9%).

Multiple regression analyses were used to explore the combined effect immigrant background has on civic knowledge with other family background variables. These include gender and test language, indicators of socio-economic background (parental occupational status, parental educational attainment and home literacy resources) and parental interest in political and social issues. The following variables and their respective coding used for the analysis are:

- *Immigrant background*: Students who were born in the country of test were coded as 0; all other students (students / or parents born outside country of test) were coded as 1;
- *Gender*: Boys were coded as 0; girls were coded as 1;
- *Test language*: Students who spoke the test language at home were coded as 1; those who spoke a language other than the test language at home were coded as 0;
- *Parental occupation status*: Students were asked to indicate the occupation of their parents, which were coded according to ISCO-88 guidelines (ILO, 1990) and subsequently converted into occupational status (SEI) scores. These scores were standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 across equally weighted ICCS countries (note: this was weighted across all 36 countries that met sampling requirements).
- *Parental education attainment*: This variable, which was based on ISCED levels, was transformed into number of years of education completed.
- *Parental interest in political and social issues*: Students were asked to indicate how interested their parents are in political and social issues. Students who reported at least one parent as being quite or very interested were coded as 1. Students reporting both parents as not interested or not very interested were coded as 0.
- *Home literacy resources*: Students were asked to approximate the number of books in their home. This was converted to units of 100 books.

The regression coefficients and explained variance are shown in Table 2. The model used listwise deletion for missing data, which accounted for 14 percent of cases overall ranging from six to twenty-six percent of cases across countries.

<Insert Table 2 here>

The multiple regression model accounted for, on average, 20 percent of the variance in civic knowledge scores. When other family background effects were accounted for, students from an immigrant background performed on average 12 scale points lower than students from a non-immigrant background. There was considerable variation across countries. The model suggests that on average girls scored 16 points higher than boys, and that students who spoke the test language at home scored 28 points higher than students who spoke another language at home. Furthermore, one standard deviation on standardized SEI scores was associated with 20 points, one year of parental education attainment corresponded to 3 points, about 100 books at home corresponded to 7 points, and students who responded that their parents were very or

quite interested in political and social issues performed 20 scale points higher than other students.

Student expected participation in protests

In ICCS 2009, students were asked whether they would consider taking part in different forms of protest in the future against things they believed were wrong. They were asked to respond either "I would certainly do this", "I would probably do this", "I would probably not do this" or "I would certainly not do this" to a list of items that were categories as being legal or illegal. Two scales were derived from the nine items: *Students' expected participation in future legal protest*[1] which had a reliability of 0.79 for the pooled ICCS sample; and *Students' expected participation in future illegal protest*[2] which had a reliability of 0.83 for the pooled ICCS sample.

Table 3 reports the country scores for these two scales for all students and according to immigrant background.

<Insert Table 3 here>

Table 3 shows that immigrant background had little effect on whether students were likely to participate in future protest action, regardless of whether the protest was legal or illegal. On average the difference between the two groups of immigrant and non-immigrant background was non-significant for both scales. There was some variation at the country level. Students from non-immigrant background in Austria, Ireland and Luxembourg were more likely to indicate a likelihood of participation in future legal protests than students from an immigrant background. The opposite was found in England where the immigrant sub-group had higher scale scores than the other one. Immigrant students from Austria, Belgium (Flemish), Luxembourg and Slovenia had higher scale scores for expected participation in future legal protest than other students, whereas Ireland was the sole country where there was a significant difference in the opposite direction.

Student expected political participation

The ICCS 2009 student questionnaire also contained two questions that asked whether students expected to participate in activities related to politics. They were asked to respond either "I will certainly do this", "I will probably do this", "I will probably *not* do this" or "I will certainly *not* do this". Three scales were derived from these two questions: *Students' expected adult electoral participation*[3] which had a reliability of 0.82 for the pooled ICCS sample; *Students' expected adult participation in political*

---

[1] *Legal protest activities: w*riting a letter to a newspaper; wearing a badge or t-shirt expressing your opinion; contacting an <elected representative>; taking part in a peaceful march or rally; collecting signatures for a petition; choosing not to buy certain products.

[2] *Illegal protest activities:* spray-painting protest slogans on walls; blocking traffic; occupying public buildings.

[3] *Electoral participation activities:* vote in <local elections>; vote in <national elections>; get information about candidates before voting in an election.

activities[4] with scale reliability of 0.81; and *Students' expected future informal political participation*[5] which had a scale reliability of 0.82 for the pooled ICCS sample. The scale scores for each immigrant background group are displayed in Table 4.

<Insert Table 4 here>

Table 4 shows that students from an immigrant background were more likely on average to participate in political activities and informal political activities, but were less likely to participate in electoral activities than students from a non-immigrant background. The largest between-group differences for expected electoral participation were found in Austria, Liechtenstein and Greece. Only in England and New Zealand students with immigrant background had higher scale scores. Immigrant background students scored on average at least 2 scale points higher for expected adult participation in political activities than students from a non-immigrant background in Belgium (Flemish), England and New Zealand, while Liechtenstein was the only country to show significantly higher scale scores for the non-immigrant group. Belgium (Flemish) and England showed the largest scale score difference in favour of the immigrant group for expected future informal political participation.

The role of immigrant background in predicting expected adult electoral participation was explored further in the multiple regression analysis displayed in Table 5.

<Insert Table 5 here>

The model in Table 5 accounts for 12 percent of variance in scale score on average. Students from an immigrant background on average scored one scale point below students from a non-immigrant background when other factors in the model were accounted for. However, this variable was a statistically significant predictor only in less than half of these countries. On average, gender was not a significant predictor in the model whereas parental occupation, parental education, number of books at home and parental interest in political and social issues all showed positive associations with the dependent variable.

Student citizenship self-efficacy

Students were asked to also rate how well they believe they are able to undertake different activities. They rated their confidence to do these activities as "Very well", "Fairly well", "Not very well" or "Not at all". All seven items in the question were used to form the scale *Students citizenship self-efficacy*[6] which had a reliability of

---

[4] *Political participation activities:* help a candidate or party during an election campaign; join a political party; join a trade union; stand as a candidate in <local elections>.

[5] *Informal political participation activities:* talk to others about your views on political and social issues; write to a newspaper about political and social issues; contribute to an online discussion forum about social and political issues; join an organisation for a political and social cause.

[6] *Students' citizenship self-efficacy activities:* discuss a newspaper article about a conflict between countries; argue your point of view about a controversial political or social issue; stand as a candidate in a <school election>; organize a group of students in order to achieve changes at school; follow a television debate about a controversial issue; write a letter to a newspaper giving your view on a current issue; speak in front of your class about a social or political issue.

0.82 from the pooled ICCS sample. Table 6 compares scale scores for immigrant and non-immigrant students.

<Insert Table 6 here>

On average, students from an immigrant background had slightly higher levels of citizenship self-efficacy than students from a non-immigrant background. These differences were largest in Belgium (Flemish) and England having the largest differences between the two groups. However, in eight of the thirteen countries no statistically significant differences were found. The relationship between immigrant background and this scale was explored further in the multiple regression analysis in Table 7.

<Insert Table 7 here>

The model in Table 7 accounted for only four percent of variance in citizenship self-efficacy. On average, students from an immigrant background scored approximately half a point higher on the scale once the effects for other factors in the model were accounted for. Boys were more likely on average to have higher levels of citizenship self-efficacy. The average regression coefficients for parental occupation, parental education, and number of books in the household were all significant. However, only relatively few statistically significant coefficients for these variables were found in individual countries. In all participating countries parental interest in political and social topics was positively associated with increased self-efficacy ratings: On average, whether students had at least one parent quite or very interested in political/social issues or not was associated with a score point difference of 3.6.

Discussion and conclusions

The analyses of the influence of immigrant background on measures of students' civic knowledge and engagement are helpful in providing further understanding with regard to the challenges facing civic and citizenship education. Higher mobility rates have led to increasingly diverse populations, and the notion of focusing education in this area to national civic systems and principles has less relevance than it used to have in the past. At the same time the concept of educating students with a more global perspective of what it means to be a citizen becomes more salient.

Students from an immigrant background appear to be at a disadvantage in terms of civic knowledge. The finding supports previous surveys that much of this difference may be attributed to the socio-economic disadvantage for immigrant students, but not entirely (OECD, 2012). Hong Kong SAR was the only country where students from an immigrant background outperformed their peers on the test of civic knowledge. This is possibly due the unique circumstances of the immigrant population of this special administrative region of China, which by definition of the study includes students from mainland China as immigrants who may not have the same socioeconomic or linguistic disadvantages as immigrants in other countries of the study.

Despite having lower levels of civic knowledge, students with immigrant background tended to express slightly more confidence in their ability to engage in civic and citizenship issues than other students. This is an interesting finding, considering the

positive relationship reported between civic knowledge and self-efficacy measures of citizenship and political issues (Schulz et al., 2010).

Students with an immigrant background were found to be more likely to report intentions to participate in political activities and informal political activities, suggesting that while they may have less understanding of issues related to civics and citizenship than other students, this does not prevent them from engaging in civic life. For some of these students, these activities may not have been as freely available to them from their family's country of origin. In contrast, the students from immigrant background were less likely to indicate a willingness to participate in future electoral activities. It is suggested that the cause of this is likely to be due to the fact that a large proportion of these students may not have citizenship status in their country of residence, and expect that they would not be able to vote in the future. Students with an immigrant background were just as likely to intend to participate in future legal or illegal protests even though there was some variation between countries.

The findings of the study support a notion that students whose families originate from other countries are likely to have lower levels of civic knowledge, but that this does not affect their intentions for participation in political activities, with the exception of formal electoral participation. However, the results also show that there are many different findings across countries that may be due to different national approaches and educational policies regarding the integration of immigrants. In countries where large differences were observed, these approaches may need to be refined toward civic-related policies that focus less on the notion of nation states and more on globalised citizenship.

References

Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* The Hague: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

International Labour Organization (ILO). (1990). *International Standard Classification of Occupations: ISCO-88*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Kao, G. (2004). Social capital and its relevance to minority and immigrant populations. *Sociology of Education*, 77, 172-183.

Kao, G. and Thompson, J. S. (2003). Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and attainment. In K.S. Cook & J. Hagan (Eds.), *Annual Review of Sociology* (Vol.29, pp.417-442). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Kennedy K.J. Global Trends in Civic and Citizenship Education: What are the Lessons for Nation States? *Education Sciences*. 2012; 2(3):121-135.

OECD (2012). Untapped Skills: Realising the potential of immigrant students. Paris: OECD publishing.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: a review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005, *Research Papers in Education*, 21(4), 433-466.

Schulz, W. (2011). The reporting of ICCS results. In W. Schulz, J. Ainley, J., & J. Fraillon (Eds.). *ICCS 2009 Technical Report* (pp. 261-280). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008). *International civic and citizenship education study: Assessment framework*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W. & Fraillon, J. (2011). Scaling procedures for ICCS test items. In W. Schulz, J. Ainley, J., & J. Fraillon (Eds.). *ICCS 2009 Technical Report* (pp. 129-156). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W. & Friedman, T. (2011). Scaling procedures for ICCS questionnaire items. In W. Schulz, J. Ainley, & J. Fraillon (Eds.). ICCS *2009 Technical Report* (pp. 157-257). Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Stanat, P., & Christensen, G. (2006). Where immigrant students succeed: A comparative review of performance and engagement in PISA 2003. Paris: OECD Publications.

Zadja, J. (2009). Globalisation, nation building and cultural identity: The role of intercultural dialogue. In J. Zajda, H. Daun, & L. Saha (Eds.), N*ation-building, identity and citizenship education* (pp. 15-24). Frankfurt, Germany: Springer.

Tables

Table 1 **Percentages of students from immigrant or non-immigrant background and its effect on civic knowledge**

	Non-immigrant background				Immigrant background				Effect of immigrant status on Civic Knowledge			
Country	**Percentages**		**Civic Knowledge score**		**Percentages**		**Civic Knowledge score**		**Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)***		**Variance explained**	
Austria	81	(1.5)	516	(4.0)	19	(1.5)	460	(6.0)	**57**	(6.4)	5	(1.3)
Belgium (Flemish) †	89	(1.2)	520	(4.7)	11	(1.2)	479	(6.5)	**41**	(7.0)	2	(0.8)
England ‡	85	(1.9)	524	(4.0)	15	(1.9)	506	(10.4)	18	(9.7)	0	(0.4)
Spain	89	(1.2)	511	(4.1)	11	(1.2)	462	(8.5)	**48**	(8.5)	3	(1.2)
Greece	89	(1.0)	483	(4.4)	11	(1.0)	428	(8.8)	**54**	(8.6)	3	(1.0)
Ireland	88	(1.1)	541	(4.6)	12	(1.1)	498	(7.8)	**43**	(7.7)	2	(0.7)
Liechtenstein	66	(2.5)	552	(5.4)	34	(2.5)	505	(7.4)	**47**	(10.4)	6	(2.5)
Luxembourg	57	(1.1)	501	(2.5)	43	(1.1)	444	(3.5)	**56**	(4.4)	9	(1.3)
New Zealand †	77	(1.5)	525	(5.0)	23	(1.5)	505	(7.0)	**19**	(6.3)	1	(0.4)
Norway †	90	(1.4)	523	(3.6)	10	(1.4)	472	(6.8)	**51**	(7.6)	3	(0.9)
Slovenia	90	(0.9)	520	(2.8)	10	(0.9)	484	(5.4)	**36**	(5.6)	2	(0.5)
Sweden	86	(1.2)	547	(3.5)	14	(1.2)	491	(5.9)	**56**	(6.7)	4	(1.0)
Switzerland †	76	(1.7)	545	(4.1)	24	(1.7)	499	(4.5)	**46**	(5.7)	6	(1.2)
Average	82	(0.1)	524	(0.4)	18	(0.1)	480	(0.7)	44	(0.7)	4	(0.1)
Hong Kong SAR	64	(1.7)	548	(5.7)	36	(1.7)	565	(7.0)	**-17**	(5.7)	1	(0.5)
Netherlands	87	(2.2)	498	(7.3)	13	(2.2)	456	(14.2)	**43**	(12.8)	2	(1.6)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 2 **Regression model for students' civic knowledge predicted by family background variables**

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients *

Country	Immigrant background (0=no immigrant background; 1=immigrant background)		Gender (0=boy; 1=girl)		Test language (0=other language; 1=test language)		Parental occupation (standardized SEI score)		Parental education (years)		Number of books at home (in hundreds)		Parental interest (0=not or not very interested; 1=quite or very interested)		Percentage of explained variance	
Austria	-10.9	(7.5)	**11.9**	(3.7)	**35.6**	(7.7)	**16.0**	(2.5)	**3.1**	(0.9)	**7.7**	(1.1)	**28.7**	(5.2)	19	(1.9)
Belgium (Flemish) †	5.9	(7.3)	4.3	(5.1)	**50.8**	(8.6)	**21.6**	(2.4)	1.6	(0.9)	**5.4**	(1.4)	**11.7**	(3.3)	17	(2.3)
England ‡	0.7	(8.9)	**18.6**	(7.5)	**21.4**	(9.4)	**29.3**	(3.3)	0.7	(1.3)	**12.2**	(1.3)	**24.7**	(5.2)	25	(3.0)
Greece	-17.5	(9.2)	**28.8**	(4.5)	**30.3**	(11.7)	**16.5**	(2.8)	**2.8**	(0.8)	**2.9**	(1.0)	**34.3**	(4.2)	16	(1.7)
Ireland	**-24.5**	(6.8)	**14.8**	(5.0)	**21.6**	(7.4)	**20.8**	(2.9)	**3.9**	(1.0)	**11.2**	(1.1)	**20.1**	(5.8)	19	(2.0)
Liechtenstein	-13.1	(10.2)	10.2	(8.9)	**51.4**	(17.3)	**26.8**	(5.7)	0.7	(1.7)	**6.0**	(2.0)	10.5	(12.3)	28	(4.3)
Luxembourg	**-20.9**	(4.5)	**8.0**	(3.9)	9.8	(5.8)	**20.4**	(2.3)	**1.5**	(0.6)	**7.5**	(0.6)	**19.0**	(4.2)	24	(1.7)
New Zealand †	-4.4	(5.6)	**25.8**	(6.7)	**45.2**	(10.0)	**27.3**	(3.2)	**4.8**	(1.3)	**8.9**	(1.4)	**20.2**	(5.3)	19	(2.1)
Norway †	-17.3	(12.1)	**16.5**	(4.2)	11.1	(12.3)	**18.3**	(2.4)	**4.9**	(1.2)	**8.5**	(0.9)	**24.5**	(4.6)	19	(1.8)
Slovenia	**-14.7**	(6.4)	**25.9**	(3.7)	**19.7**	(8.3)	**16.5**	(1.8)	**2.5**	(1.1)	**4.0**	(1.2)	**19.5**	(4.3)	14	(1.5)
Spain	**-22.9**	(7.2)	**17.5**	(3.3)	**17.8**	(8.1)	**14.4**	(2.0)	**3.1**	(0.5)	**5.2**	(1.0)	**19.4**	(3.6)	19	(2.0)
Sweden	-4.3	(10.5)	**14.9**	(4.2)	**27.5**	(11.7)	**22.3**	(2.4)	**4.9**	(1.2)	**9.4**	(0.9)	**11.0**	(4.3)	20	(1.9)
Switzerland †	**-12.8**	(5.3)	**9.0**	(3.8)	**25.3**	(8.5)	**16.1**	(2.7)	**2.9**	(0.8)	**5.0**	(1.1)	**19.0**	(6.2)	20	(2.3)
Average	**-12.1**	(2.2)	**15.9**	(1.5)	**28.3**	(2.8)	**20.5**	(0.8)	**2.9**	(0.3)	**7.2**	(0.3)	**20.2**	(1.6)	20	(0.6)
Hong Kong SAR	**30.7**	(5.1)	16.4	(8.4)	8.1	(8.7)	6.6	(3.8)	**2.2**	(0.9)	3.2	(1.7)	**10.6**	(4.6)	4	(1.0)
Netherlands	**-37.7**	(13.8)	7.1	(8.5)	-8.1	(7.6)	**10.8**	(4.7)	1.8	(1.7)	**8.0**	(1.9)	**29.4**	(6.7)	13	(3.2)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 3 **Differences in expected participation in future legal and illegal protests by immigration background**

Country	Students' expected participation in future legal protest				Students' expected participation in future illegal protest			
	All students	Non-immigrant background	Immigrant background	Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)*	All students	Non-immigrant background	Immigrant background	Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)*
Austria	50 (0.2)	51 (0.2)	50 (0.4)	**1** (0.4)	49 (0.3)	49 (0.3)	50 (0.5)	**-1** (0.5)
Belgium (Flemish) †	47 (0.2)	47 (0.2)	47 (0.5)	-1 (0.6)	49 (0.3)	48 (0.3)	50 (0.6)	**-1** (0.6)
England ‡	50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	52 (0.7)	**-2** (0.7)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.6)	1 (0.7)
Greece	52 (0.2)	52 (0.2)	51 (0.7)	0 (0.7)	56 (0.3)	56 (0.3)	57 (0.6)	-1 (0.6)
Ireland	51 (0.2)	52 (0.3)	50 (0.5)	**1** (0.5)	51 (0.2)	51 (0.2)	50 (0.5)	**2** (0.6)
Liechtenstein	48 (0.5)	48 (0.6)	49 (0.9)	0 (1.1)	49 (0.5)	49 (0.7)	49 (0.9)	0 (1.1)
Luxembourg	49 (0.2)	50 (0.2)	49 (0.3)	**1** (0.3)	50 (0.2)	50 (0.3)	51 (0.3)	**-2** (0.3)
New Zealand †	50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.4)	0 (0.5)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.5)	1 (0.6)
Norway †	48 (0.2)	48 (0.2)	48 (0.9)	0 (0.9)	47 (0.3)	47 (0.3)	48 (0.6)	-1 (0.6)
Slovenia	49 (0.2)	49 (0.2)	49 (0.6)	0 (0.6)	50 (0.3)	49 (0.3)	51 (0.6)	**-1** (0.7)
Spain	50 (0.2)	50 (0.2)	50 (0.6)	0 (0.6)	50 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	51 (0.7)	-1 (0.7)
Sweden	48 (0.2)	48 (0.2)	48 (0.5)	0 (0.6)	47 (0.2)	47 (0.2)	48 (0.4)	0 (0.4)
Switzerland †	48 (0.2)	48 (0.3)	47 (0.5)	1 (0.6)	48 (0.4)	48 (0.4)	49 (0.6)	0 (0.5)
Average	49 (0.1)	49 (0.1)	49 (0.2)	0 (0.3)	50 (0.1)	50 (0.1)	50 (0.2)	0 (0.3)
Hong Kong SAR	47 (0.2)	47 (0.3)	48 (0.5)	-1 (0.5)	44 (0.3)	44 (0.3)	44 (0.4)	0 (0.4)
Netherlands	46 (0.5)	46 (0.5)	46 (1.1)	0 (1.0)	50 (0.4)	50 (0.4)	50 (1.0)	0 (1.0)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 4 **Differences in expected participation in electoral and political activities by immigration background**

Country	Students' expected adult electoral participation								Students' expected adult participation in political activities								Students' expected future informal political participation							
	All students		Non-immigrant background		Immigrant background		Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)		All students		Non-immigrant background		Immigrant background		Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)		All students		Non-immigrant background		Immigrant background		Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)	
Austria	51	(0.2)	52	(0.2)	47	(0.4)	**4**	(0.4)	51	(0.2)	51	(0.2)	51	(0.4)	0	(0.4)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.2)	49	(0.5)	**-1**	(0.5)
Belgium (Flemish) †	46	(0.2)	46	(0.3)	45	(0.6)	0	(0.6)	45	(0.2)	45	(0.2)	48	(0.6)	**-3**	(0.7)	46	(0.2)	46	(0.2)	49	(0.6)	**-3**	(0.6)
England ‡	47	(0.3)	47	(0.3)	50	(0.6)	**-3**	(0.6)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	51	(0.5)	**-2**	(0.6)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.3)	52	(0.5)	**-3**	(0.6)
Greece	50	(0.3)	51	(0.3)	46	(0.7)	**4**	(0.7)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	51	(0.7)	-1	(0.7)	53	(0.2)	53	(0.2)	53	(0.6)	0	(0.7)
Ireland	52	(0.3)	53	(0.3)	50	(0.6)	**3**	(0.7)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	51	(0.6)	0	(0.6)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	50	(0.6)	**-2**	(0.6)
Liechtenstein	50	(0.4)	52	(0.6)	47	(0.8)	**5**	(1.0)	51	(0.5)	52	(0.6)	49	(0.8)	**2**	(1.0)	47	(0.5)	47	(0.7)	48	(0.8)	-1	(1.0)
Luxembourg	47	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	46	(0.3)	**3**	(0.4)	51	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	51	(0.3)	-1	(0.4)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.2)	49	(0.3)	**-1**	(0.4)
New Zealand †	49	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	**-1**	(0.5)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	50	(0.5)	**-2**	(0.5)	49	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	**-2**	(0.5)
Norway †	52	(0.3)	52	(0.3)	49	(0.7)	**3**	(0.7)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	50	(0.7)	-1	(0.7)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.2)	50	(0.9)	-2	(0.9)
Slovenia	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	48	(0.7)	**2**	(0.7)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	49	(0.6)	0	(0.6)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.6)	0	(0.6)
Spain	51	(0.3)	51	(0.3)	48	(0.8)	**3**	(0.8)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	50	(0.7)	-1	(0.7)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.2)	50	(0.7)	-1	(0.8)
Sweden	49	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	48	(0.5)	**1**	(0.6)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.3)	50	(0.4)	0	(0.4)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	49	(0.4)	-1	(0.5)
Switzerland †	48	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	46	(0.6)	**3**	(0.6)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.4)	1	(0.4)	47	(0.2)	47	(0.2)	47	(0.5)	0	(0.5)
Average	49	(0.1)	50	(0.1)	48	(0.2)	**1**	(0.3)	49	(0.1)	49	(0.1)	50	(0.2)	**-1**	(0.2)	48	(0.1)	48	(0.1)	50	(0.2)	**-2**	(0.2)
Hong Kong SAR	48	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	48	(0.4)	**0**	(0.4)	47	(0.2)	47	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	**-1**	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	50	(0.2)	51	(0.4)	-1	(0.3)
Netherlands	47	(0.4)	47	(0.4)	46	(1.0)	**1**	(1.0)	49	(0.4)	49	(0.4)	48	(0.8)	0	(0.8)	46	(0.6)	46	(0.5)	47	(1.0)	0	(0.8)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 5 **Regression model for students' expected electoral participation predicted by family background variables**

	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients *																			
Country	**Immigrant background (0=no immigrant background; 1=immigrant background)**		**Gender (0=boy; 1=girl)**		**Test language (0=other language; 1=test language)**		**Parental occupation (standardized SEI score)**		**Parental education (years)**		**Number of books at home (in hundreds)**		**Parental interest (0=not or not very interested; 1=quite or very interested)**		**Percentage of explained variance**	
Austria	**-2.6**	(0.6)	**-1.1**	(0.4)	1.3	(0.8)	0.1	(0.2)	**0.3**	(0.1)	**0.4**	(0.1)	**6.0**	(0.5)	14	(1.6)
Belgium (Flemish) †	0.1	(1.0)	-0.3	(0.4)	0.1	(1.0)	**0.9**	(0.2)	0.0	(0.1)	**0.4**	(0.1)	**4.6**	(0.5)	8	(1.1)
England ‡	**1.8**	(0.9)	-0.6	(0.5)	-1.1	(0.9)	**1.6**	(0.3)	0.0	(0.1)	**0.8**	(0.1)	**6.9**	(0.5)	22	(2.2)
Greece	**-2.7**	(0.8)	**0.9**	(0.4)	0.5	(1.2)	**0.8**	(0.3)	0.1	(0.1)	0.2	(0.1)	**4.5**	(0.5)	7	(1.1)
Ireland	**-2.0**	(0.7)	**1.6**	(0.4)	1.2	(0.8)	**0.7**	(0.2)	**0.3**	(0.1)	**0.5**	(0.1)	**5.5**	(0.5)	12	(1.3)
Liechtenstein	**-4.0**	(1.2)	-0.4	(1.0)	-0.2	(1.6)	0.6	(0.6)	0.0	(0.2)	0.3	(0.3)	**5.4**	(1.4)	14	(3.6)
Luxembourg	-0.7	(0.4)	**-0.9**	(0.3)	0.1	(0.8)	**1.0**	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	**0.4**	(0.1)	**5.5**	(0.4)	13	(1.1)
New Zealand †	1.1	(0.6)	**1.5**	(0.5)	1.3	(0.8)	**1.4**	(0.3)	**0.3**	(0.1)	**0.5**	(0.1)	**5.5**	(0.5)	13	(1.6)
Norway †	-0.9	(1.4)	**1.1**	(0.4)	0.9	(1.5)	**1.3**	(0.3)	**0.5**	(0.2)	**0.4**	(0.1)	**6.0**	(0.6)	14	(1.7)
Slovenia	-0.7	(0.7)	0.4	(0.4)	1.5	(1.0)	**0.5**	(0.2)	**0.2**	(0.1)	**0.4**	(0.1)	**5.3**	(0.5)	9	(1.3)
Spain	**-1.6**	(0.7)	0.3	(0.3)	**2.0**	(0.6)	**0.5**	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	0.2	(0.1)	**4.6**	(0.4)	8	(1.2)
Sweden	1.3	(0.9)	**1.0**	(0.3)	1.2	(1.0)	**1.1**	(0.3)	0.2	(0.1)	**0.5**	(0.1)	**4.6**	(0.4)	12	(1.4)
Switzerland †	-0.7	(0.7)	-0.8	(0.4)	**2.1**	(0.6)	0.1	(0.3)	**0.6**	(0.1)	0.3	(0.2)	**5.8**	(0.5)	14	(1.9)
Average	**-0.9**	(0.2)	0.2	(0.1)	**0.9**	(0.3)	**0.8**	(0.1)	**0.2**	(0.0)	**0.4**	(0.0)	**5.4**	(0.2)	12	(0.5)
Hong Kong SAR	0.6	(0.4)	0.1	(0.5)	0.7	(1.2)	-0.2	(0.3)	**0.2**	(0.1)	**0.7**	(0.1)	**3.6**	(0.5)	5	(1.0)
Netherlands	0.7	(1.0)	-0.3	(0.5)	0.9	(2.0)	0.6	(0.3)	**0.3**	(0.1)	**0.7**	(0.1)	**5.4**	(0.7)	13	(1.8)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 6 **Student citizenship self-efficacy ratings by immigration background**

Students citizenship self-efficacy

Country	All students		Non-immigrant background		Immigrant background		Difference (non-immigrant - immigrant)	
Austria	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	50	(0.4)	0	(0.5)
Belgium (Flemish) †	47	(0.2)	47	(0.2)	50	(0.6)	**-3**	(0.6)
England ‡	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	53	(0.6)	**-3**	(0.6)
Greece	52	(0.2)	52	(0.3)	51	(0.6)	1	(0.6)
Ireland	49	(0.2)	49	(0.3)	49	(0.5)	-1	(0.6)
Liechtenstein	48	(0.4)	48	(0.6)	49	(0.7)	-1	(0.9)
Luxembourg	48	(0.2)	48	(0.2)	48	(0.3)	0	(0.4)
New Zealand †	48	(0.3)	48	(0.3)	49	(0.4)	**-2**	(0.6)
Norway †	50	(0.2)	50	(0.2)	52	(0.7)	**-2**	(0.7)
Slovenia	50	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	50	(0.6)	0	(0.6)
Spain	49	(0.2)	49	(0.2)	49	(0.8)	1	(0.8)
Sweden	49	(0.3)	49	(0.3)	51	(0.6)	**-2**	(0.7)
Switzerland †	48	(0.2)	47	(0.2)	48	(0.4)	-1	(0.5)
Average	49	(0.1)	49	(0.1)	50	(0.2)	**-1**	(0.3)
Hong Kong SAR	50	(0.2)	50	(0.3)	50	(0.3)	0	(0.3)
Netherlands	48	(0.6)	47	(0.5)	50	(1.1)	**-2**	(0.9)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.

Table 7 **Regression model for students' citizenship self-efficacy predicted by family background variables**

	Unstandardized Regression Coefficients *																			
Country	**Immigrant background (0=no immigrant background; 1=immigrant background)**		**Gender (0=boy; 1=girl)**		**Test language (0=other language; 1=test language)**		**Parental occupation (standardized SEI score)**		**Parental education (years)**		**Number of books at home (in hundreds)**		**Parental interest (0=not or not very interested; 1=quite or very interested)**		**Percentage of explained variance**	
Austria	0.0	(0.7)	**-2.6**	(0.4)	0.0	(0.8)	**-0.7**	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	0.1	(0.1)	**3.2**	(0.5)	4	(0.8)
Belgium (Flemish) †	**2.0**	(0.8)	**-1.0**	(0.4)	**-2.0**	(1.0)	0.1	(0.2)	0.0	(0.1)	0.3	(0.2)	**2.7**	(0.5)	3	(0.9)
England ‡	0.6	(0.7)	-0.4	(0.4)	-1.5	(0.9)	-0.1	(0.2)	0.2	(0.1)	**0.2**	(0.1)	**4.2**	(0.5)	6	(1.2)
Greece	1.0	(0.9)	**-1.7**	(0.3)	-0.2	(1.1)	**-0.5**	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	0.1	(0.1)	**2.0**	(0.4)	2	(0.5)
Ireland	0.4	(0.7)	-0.4	(0.4)	0.3	(0.8)	-0.3	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	**0.3**	(0.1)	**4.5**	(0.4)	4	(0.7)
Liechtenstein	**-2.2**	(1.0)	**-2.4**	(0.9)	-0.5	(1.7)	-0.5	(0.6)	0.3	(0.2)	-0.1	(0.2)	**4.6**	(1.2)	8	(3.3)
Luxembourg	**0.8**	(0.4)	**-1.1**	(0.3)	-0.7	(0.7)	-0.2	(0.2)	0.0	(0.1)	-0.1	(0.1)	**3.6**	(0.5)	3	(0.8)
New Zealand †	0.9	(0.6)	0.4	(0.5)	-0.7	(0.7)	-0.3	(0.2)	0.0	(0.2)	0.1	(0.1)	**4.4**	(0.6)	4	(1.1)
Norway †	0.9	(1.4)	-0.5	(0.4)	0.5	(1.4)	0.1	(0.2)	0.2	(0.1)	0.2	(0.1)	**3.0**	(0.6)	3	(0.9)
Slovenia	**1.4**	(0.7)	**-2.6**	(0.4)	**2.2**	(0.9)	**-0.5**	(0.2)	-0.1	(0.1)	**0.2**	(0.1)	**3.4**	(0.4)	5	(0.9)
Spain	1.0	(0.8)	-0.6	(0.4)	0.6	(0.6)	-0.4	(0.3)	0.0	(0.1)	-0.1	(0.1)	**3.7**	(0.5)	3	(0.7)
Sweden	0.2	(0.7)	-0.3	(0.3)	-0.6	(0.8)	0.2	(0.2)	0.0	(0.1)	**0.2**	(0.1)	**3.1**	(0.5)	4	(0.9)
Switzerland †	-0.2	(0.5)	**-1.9**	(0.4)	0.8	(0.6)	-0.2	(0.3)	0.1	(0.1)	0.1	(0.1)	**4.5**	(0.5)	7	(1.0)
Average	**0.5**	(0.2)	**-1.2**	(0.1)	-0.1	(0.3)	**-0.2**	(0.1)	**0.1**	(0.0)	**0.1**	(0.0)	**3.6**	(0.2)	4	(0.3)
Hong Kong SAR	**1.0**	(0.4)	**-1.3**	(0.4)	-0.7	(1.0)	-0.2	(0.3)	-0.1	(0.1)	**0.4**	(0.2)	**2.6**	(0.5)	3	(0.8)
Netherlands	-0.8	(1.3)	**-0.9**	(0.4)	-1.0	(1.6)	0.2	(0.3)	0.1	(0.1)	0.1	(0.1)	**3.2**	(0.8)	4	(1.7)

* Statistically significant ($p<0.05$) coefficients in **bold**.

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because some results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.