


# Psychology: the Journal of the Hellenic Psychological Society

Vol 29, No 1 (2024)

June 2024



## Exploring emotional, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions of young citizens' political engagement in uncertain times

*Katerina Karageorgou, Anna Madoglou, Dimitris Kalamaras*

doi: [10.12681/psy\\_hps.33997](https://doi.org/10.12681/psy_hps.33997)

Copyright © 2024, Katerina Karageorgou, Anna Madoglou, Dimitris Kalamaras



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

### To cite this article:

Karageorgou, K., Madoglou, A., & Kalamaras, D. (2024). Exploring emotional, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions of young citizens' political engagement in uncertain times. *Psychology: The Journal of the Hellenic Psychological Society*, 29(1), 100–120. [https://doi.org/10.12681/psy\\_hps.33997](https://doi.org/10.12681/psy_hps.33997)

## ΕΜΠΕΙΡΙΚΗ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ | RESEARCH PAPER

# Exploring emotional, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions of young citizens' political engagement in uncertain times

Katerina KARAGEORGOU<sup>1</sup>, Anna MADOGLOU<sup>1</sup>, Dimitrios KALAMARAS<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences

## KEYWORDS

Political engagement  
Emotions  
Political interest  
Political participation  
Uncertainty  
Young citizens

## CORRESPONDENCE

Katerina Karageorgou  
Department of Psychology,  
Panteion University of Social  
and Political Sciences  
136 Syngrou Avenue, 17671  
Athens Greece  
[aik.karageorgou@panteion.gr](mailto:aik.karageorgou@panteion.gr)

## ABSTRACT

Political engagement (PE) is approached as a complex concept that incorporates cognitive, behavioural, and emotional aspects. This study aims to investigate the suggested typology of PE (partisan, apartisan, stand-by, apolitical, antipolitical), and to identify those variables (cognitive, emotional, behavioural) that contribute to the appearance of each type. Surveys are conducted in the UK, France, and Greece, as these countries both represent and experience different types of crises. Participants (N=1.005), from 18 to 35 years old, were classified into the types according to their self-positioning on PE typology. Five models of logistic regression were applied to our samples. The five types of PE were used as the criterion variables, whereas the emotional (emotions towards politics: enthusiasm, anxiety, aversion, disgust, disappointment, indifference; emotions towards crisis: fear/frustration, trust/optimism, anger/indignation), the cognitive (political interest: interest in politics, interest in societal issues), and the behavioural dimensions (political participation: non-digital political activism, activities of socio-political concerns, digital political activism, normative collective action, active political counter-argumentation, and pro-social activism) as predictors. Results showed that different forms of political interest, different repertoires of political behaviours, and different sets of emotions contribute to the appearance of each type of PE. Furthermore, PE types are interpreted through the complexity of modern societies. Especially for apolitical and anti-political types of engagement, discussion suggests that they could be considered as forms of political identities in post-democratic societies of developing crises and uncertainty.

## Introduction

Literature provides contradictory interpretations of younger generations' engagement with politics. Some of them perceive young adults as passive, apathetic, uninterested, and alienated from politics while others understand them as more critical than previous generations and insist on exploring various different ways in which they can be politically engaged. Far from considering them as apathetic and passive, this study strives to investigate the alternative forms of behaviours, thoughts, and feelings that emerge when young adults interact with politics and crises, especially over the last decades when they seem as particularly disillusioned with the major institutions of representative democracy (Blais et al., 2004; Blais & G lineau, 2007; Dalton, 1996; Putnam, 2000) and the rise of an anti-political culture of negative feelings towards politics is also observed (Hay & Stoker, 2009). In other words, we attempt to gain a more profound understanding of how European young citizens engage

politically during uncertain times as an effort to better understand their contribution to social change and the evolution of European societies.

### ***The typology of political (dis)engagement***

Political science literature suggests various concepts for describing young citizens' (dis)engagement with politics. For example, in Amna and Ekman's (2014) typology are found three distinctive forms of political passivity based on young people's levels of political participation and political interest: stand-by (highest interest and average participation), unengaged (low interest and low participation) and disillusioned citizens (low participation and lowest on interest). They argue that political passivity is not a unidimensional phenomenon but it encompasses two kinds of genuinely passive people, unengaged as well as disillusioned citizens, and a third kind of seemingly passive citizens who are prepared for political action, should circumstances warrant: the stand-byers. The fourth type concerns active citizens who score high on interest and highest on participation.

Furthermore, Norris (2002, 2011) introduces the concept of "critical citizens". According to her, they belong to the younger cohorts of voters, they tend to be better educated and better informed politically than the previous generations and more ready to display their dissatisfaction through either electoral abstention or alternative forms of political protest. Dalton's (2013) typology contains four groups that represent distinct mobilisation patterns. We find among them the "apolitical independents" who lack both party cues and cognitive skills, and the "apartisans" who lack party ties but score high on the cognitive mobilisation dimensions. Two additional categories, those of "ritual" and "cognitive" partisans, describe the active citizens. Finally, Schudson's (1996, 1998) "monitorial citizens" will act only when they feel the need to intervene but, until then, they stay out of politics.

In previous qualitative research conducted in 2014 (Karageorgou, 2019), we explored how the concept of apoliticism is reflected among Greek citizens and we concluded that the social representation of apoliticism is diffused through a polemic juxtaposition between the opposites of *apathy* and *protest*. The former perceives apoliticism as a form of indifference and apathy towards politics and society, while the latter considers apoliticism as an act of protest and reaction against the political system. In another study (Karageorgou et al., 2018), we confirmed the existence of Amna and Ekman's (2014) typology among Greek youth.

Based on the above-mentioned results, the next study (Karageorgou, 2019) conducted in 2017 put forward a further refinement of Amna and Ekman's typology suggesting a more appropriate terminology. More precisely, we divided active citizens into two separated groups, those of partisans and those of apartisans, and based on Ekman and Amna's (2012) apolitical and anti-political forms of disengagement we suggested those terms for referring to "unengaged" and "disillusioned" as they are frequently used and shared among citizens in everyday contexts. The renewed typology distinguished between five forms of engagement among citizens: partisan, apartisan, stand-by, apolitical, and anti-political engagement.

As shown in Table.1, the term "partisan" corresponds to Dalton's (2013) both cognitive and ritual partisans, as well as Amna and Ekman's (2014) active citizens. The term "apartisan" engagement is used for "active" (Amna & Ekman, 2014) and "apartisan" citizens (Dalton, 2013). The term "stand-by" is unchanged and also represents Schudson's (1996, 1998) "monitorial" citizens. The term "apolitical" corresponds to "unengaged" (Amna & Ekman, 2014) and "apolitical independents" (Dalton, 2013). Finally, the term "anti-political" describes "disillusioned" citizens (Amna & Ekman, 2014).

The suggested typology tries not only to represent previous typologies that are combined by different levels of political interest and political participation but to embrace also the emotional dimension that is not found among them (as it is described below).

**Table 1.** *The updated typology of political engagement (PE)*

Type of PE	Amna & Ekman's Typology	Dalton's Typology	Schundson's Concept
Partisan	"Active"	"Ritual" & "Cognitive" Partisans	-
Apartisan	"Active"	"Apartisans"	-
Stand-by	"Stand-by"	-	"Monitorial"
Apolitical	"Unengaged"	"Apolitical Independents"	-
Anti-political	"Disillusioned"	-	-

### ***Political (dis)engagement***

The literature to date provides mixed evidence regarding the meaning of political engagement (PE). A body of the literature focuses on the behavioural processes, while other lines of the literature emphasize the emotional or the cognitive or a combination of those processes. Prati et al. (2022) suggest that PE "encompasses actions designed to influence the choice of governing actors including citizens' voluntary activities of knowing and influencing political choices at various levels of the political system" (p. 154). McCartney (2013) focuses also on the behavioural dimension and suggests that PE refers to "explicitly politically oriented activities that seek a direct impact on political issues, systems, relationships, and structures" (p.14). Beyond the purely behavioural aspects of PE, Carreras (2016) adds the cognitive component, distinguishing PE into two forms: a) the cognitive one that is used to denote "a citizen's psychological attachment to the political system" (p. 161) including political interest, political party identification, and seeking political information; b) the active one that "manifests itself in a higher probability of contacting politicians, attending political party meetings, and participating in town public meetings" (p.161). An additional component of PE is provided by Emler (2011), arguing that PE is "a developmental process, the foundation ingredient to which is some driver to pay attention to politics" (p.141).

Moreover, research has highlighted the need to perceive PE of young people as a discrete concept of political participation (Barrett & Brunton-Smith, 2014; Pontes et al., 2018). In this context, PE is a psychological process that integrates cognitive and emotional aspects, while political participation is exclusively linked with a behavioural aspect. More precisely, Barrett and Brunton-Smith's (2014) concept defines PE as a psychological process of "having an interest in, paying attention to, or having knowledge, beliefs, opinions, attitudes, or feelings about either political or civic matters" (p.6). Pontes, Henn and Griffiths (2018) agree with the above definition and further argue that PE can take place either online or offline; it refers to a process of "having interest in paying attention to, having knowledge or opinions about, being conscious of, proactive about and constantly informed about politics" (p.17). According to them, the cognitive aspect is expressed through situations such as being interested in political agendas or signing a petition, searching for political information online or watching political debates, while the emotional aspect corresponds to situations such as holding/displaying feelings about political or civic matters, wearing a symbol, posting/sharing one's political thoughts on social media etc.

Despite the important contribution of their definition, it is observed that this updated version of PE overlaps at some points with particular forms of political participation. Consequently, this study suggests to broaden the aspects of PE by adding the behavioural dimension. In this case, PE is not limited to cognition and affection but is considered as an umbrella term that encompasses also political participation. More precisely, PE is approached as a complex concept that incorporates the emotional, the cognitive, and the behavioural aspect. The first is linked with holding/displaying feelings about political or civic matters, the second with political interest (interest in

politics, interest in societal issues), and the third with different forms of political participation. Considering this, the suggested concept could be seen as a combination of Barrett and Brunton-Smith's (2014) model that emphasizes political interest, political knowledges and feelings with Amna and Ekman's (2014) model that uses both political interest and political participation to measure citizenship styles among young people. These emotional, behavioural, and cognitive aspects of PE are supported by relevant literature as presented below:

**Emotional aspect.** For understanding the political process, political scientists and social psychologists have explored the role of emotion in political judgement and motivation (see Marcus, 2000). Marcus et al. (2006) found three dimensions of affect: enthusiasm (enthusiastic, hopeful, proud), anxiety (scared, worried, afraid), and aversion (hateful, angry, bitter, resentful). They concluded that emotions are not potentially dangerous or irrational but they serve to make citizens more sophisticated. According to the theory of affective intelligence (Marcus et al., 2000), generalized anxiety about politics causes an information search and a better use of existing resources, while enthusiasm elicits greater participation. Aversion leads people to limit their search for information, to pay selective attention, and to become close-minded about new perspectives and alternatives (MacKuen et al., 2010).

Regarding crises-related emotions, Jasper (1998) supports also the idea that emotions pervade all social life, actions, and movements, help citizens define their goals, and motivate their actions toward them. He distinguishes emotions into two separate categories: the first one is called "affects" (e.g., trust, solidarity, hope) and the latter "reactive emotions" as they constitute responses to external events and new information (e.g., anger, indignation, fear). These context-related emotional responses are formed and reinforced either outside or inside a movement. The interaction between the core categories can contribute to the development of civic and political engagement. Chrysochoou, Papastamou and Prodomitis (2013) found that emotions play an important role in predicting reactions to the financial crisis in Greece. More precisely, anger predicts higher levels of political participation and collective action, whereas positive emotions are a predictor of collective actions (but not of violent practices). Fear and frustration are a major predictor of depression.

Furthermore, the interpretation of grievances plays an important role in civic and political engagement and leads to either individual or collective actions (see Smith et al., 2012). Personal relative deprivation theory is based on the feelings of unfairness and resentment that an individual might experience through interpersonal comparisons with similar others: a sense of being deprived of deserved or desired outcomes (Crosby, 1976; Walker & Pettigrew, 1984). Callan et al. (2017) found a negative association between personal relative deprivation and prosocial behaviours. During financial crisis, Chrysochoou, Papastamou and Prodomitis (2013) found that a sense of grievance in relation to others in Greece is associated with radical forms of action, while a temporal sense of grievance with the use of the internet for political disobedience.

**Cognitive aspect.** Next dimension of PE, the cognitive one, is approached through political interest. It is considered that "citizens' political interest precedes any form of political action" (Amna & Ekman, 2014, p. 268). Political interest is "the extent to which politics is attractive to someone" and is addressed to a variety of subjects associated with public space and collective concern such as elections, human rights and public policy (Dostie-Goulet, 2009, p. 406). Another definition is referred to "a citizen's willingness to pay attention to political phenomena at the possible expense of other topics" (Lupia & Philpot, 2005, p. 1122) and is associated with political participation (Amna & Ekman, 2014) and political knowledges (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996). Levy and Akiva (2019) found political interest as a stronger predictor for young citizens' future PE than other variables such as political efficacy.

**Behavioural aspect.** Finally, in this study, political participation is perceived as the behavioural dimension of PE. Literature provides various definitions of political participation as the rise of new participatory forms leads to updates and inevitable rearrangements (Brady, 1999; Ekman & Amna, 2012; Kaase & Marsh, 1979; Verba &

Nie, 1972). Among them, we find traditional and alternative, conventional and non-conventional, manifest and latent, as well as civic and political repertoires of participation. Norris (2002) provides an all-inclusive definition according to which political participation is seen as “any dimensions of social activity that are either designed directly to influence government agencies and the policy process, or indirectly to impact civil society, or which attempt to alter systematic patterns of social behaviour” (p.16). A more recent addition is suggested by Theocharis, de Moor, and van Deth (2019); they argue that digitally networked participation should be considered as a distinct form of political participation that is particularly attractive to young and more critical citizens and might be seen as “an avenue for engaging in politics” (p.46).

**Summary of hypotheses**

To sum up, this study aims to investigate the emotional, behavioural, and cognitive aspects of the different types of PE as the latter is perceived as a complex concept that incorporates political interest (cognitive), political participation (behavioural), and emotions about political or civic matters (emotional). All studies presented in the first part prompt the following expectations:

**Table 2.** *Research hypotheses*

Hypotheses	Engagement	Emotions	Political Interest	Political Participation
Hypothesis 1	Partisan	- enthusiasm (politics) - trust/optimism (crises)	✓	✓
Hypothesis 2	Apartisan	- anxiety (politics) - anger/indignation (crises)	✓	✓
Hypothesis 3	Stand-by	- anxiety (politics) - trust/optimism (crises)	✓	✓
Hypothesis 4	Apolitical	- aversion (politics) - indifference (politics) - fear/frustration (crises)	✗	✗
Hypothesis 5	Antipolitical	- disgust (politics) - disappointment (politics) - anger/indignation (crises) - personal relative deprivation	✗	✓

\*Note. ✓: indicates that the variable constitutes a positive predictor, ✗: indicates that the variable constitutes a negative predictor.

As shown in Table 2, our hypotheses regarding the component of political participation are not linked directly with particular forms of participation. This is due to the ambiguity that exists around the political activities that young citizens prefer mostly to get involved in. Consequently, before starting our analysis, it is necessary to explore the structure of political participation and to identify the different participatory patterns that younger citizens use based on a set of 28 political activities. In our study, these patterns are going to represent the variables of political participation.

**Socio-political context**

Over the last decades, Europe has been witnessing a rise in populist and far-right parties, deepening social and political polarization, constant financial crises across countries in the union, and a rise in immigration. The aim of this project is to explore the different types of PE in three European countries during times of uncertainty. Surveys are conducted in the UK, France, and Greece, as these countries both represent and experience different

types of crises: a long-term financial crisis for Greece, a social crisis for France with the Yellow Vest Movement (YVM), and an identity crisis for the UK because of BREXIT.

More precisely, the YVM was developed through social media in 2018 and was linked with mass protests and events that took place all over France and lasted for more than 14 months. People were demonstrating against the rising price of fuel, income inequality, rising living costs, lack of social mobility, and were asking for social justice. They came from working-class backgrounds, but were members of three different voter groups (extreme left, extreme right, and non-voters) and, hence, considered as an “anti-government opposition movement” (Adam-Troian et al., 2021, p. 561). This situation indicates a kind of social and political crisis in French society.

The Brexit referendum took place in 2016, two years before the YVM, and was linked with a dilemma between remaining or leaving the EU. Established political parties took sides, while citizens were also divided between those advocating for remaining or leaving. Young citizens were concerned about limited job prospects, financial insecurity, or potential limitations on their access to opportunities within the EU. Voters finally decided to leave the EU, but only after four years of stressful and conflictual negotiations for both political actors and citizens, the UK officially left the union (2020). The referendum outcome is seen as a “divide” between *British Leave Voters* and *British Remain Voters*; the first group represents those who were deprived of economic benefits and “left behind by the forces of globalisation and immigration” and the latter “those who welcome such developments” (Hobolt, 2016, p. 1260). This division indicates a two-speed society and signifies an identity and social crisis for citizens where immigration and European integration are approached either as threats or achievements for their national identity and culture.

Regarding Greece, the debt crisis started in 2010 and affected citizens’ everyday life for over a decade. During this period, a sequence of changes occurred on multiple levels. Austerity packages, budget cuts, and taxation agreed between Greek governments and “troika” (IMF, European Central Bank, European Commission) led to high rates of unemployment, while large cuts in health-care and education had a negative impact on public services. Mass protests against unpopular measures gave rise to “indignant” and “anti-austerity” movements that occurred throughout the country, alongside the emergence of anti-establishment parties (see Vasilopoulou & Halikiopoulou, 2015). At the same time anti-immigration feelings and xenophobia also emerged. Successive elections, brief governments, and resignation of politicians illustrated the political situation of that period. In addition, a neo-fascist far right party named “Golden Dawn” was elected in the Greek Parliament (2015) but convicted as a criminal organization some years later, in 2019, because of the murder of Pavlos Fyssas. All these elements signify the multifaceted crisis (financial, social, political, institutional) that Greek society has entered and still influences citizens’ life.

Finally, covid-19 pandemic constitutes an extra crisis that appeared during this project and affected all countries. The co-occurrence of this many frameworks in which crises develop in the different European countries constitutes a fruitful context in which to inquire as to how European youth interact with the frameworks of developing crises, and in which way the context of crises influences their choice of PE.

## **Method**

### ***Participants and procedure***

One thousand and five participants (N=1005) replied to the online questionnaire between October 2020 and February 2021. More than half of the participants were females (66.5%, N=668), and the rest were males (32.8%, N=330) or answered “Other” (0.7%, N=7). The ages of participants ranged from 18 to 35 years old (M=26.14, SD=4.95). Furthermore, 40% were Greek (N=403), 35% were English (N=349), and 25% were French (N=253).

Overall, the samples used are not representative of the respective countries as they were collected through convenience sampling. More specifically, Greek participants were recruited from universities and via social

media, whereas French and English participants were recruited via PROLIFIC and were paid at a rate of \$5.21 per hour for their participation. For the English sample, three quotas were applied: age (18-35), nationality (British), and residence (UK). Regarding the French one, four quotas were used: age (18-35), nationality (French), first language (French), and residence (France). For this research, three “identical” online questionnaires were prepared in three different languages (Greek, English, French) based on the same tools (see Supplementary Materials for more details).

The median completion time for the survey was 11.3 minutes. All survey questionnaires were administered using Google Forms. The Institutional Review Board approved the procedure and all participants completed the online survey after being informed of confidentiality and giving their consent.

## Tools

**Emotions.** To measure *emotions towards politics*, we used Marcus’s et al. (2006) 12-item scale that includes three factors: enthusiasm ( $\alpha = .82$ ), anxiety ( $\alpha = .90$ ), and aversion ( $\alpha = .844$ ). We also added three extra emotions that emerged from our previous surveys: disgust, disappointment, and indifference. To measure *emotions towards crisis*, a 15-item scale (Chrysoschoou et al., 2013) was presented to participants including three factors: fear/frustration ( $\alpha = .88$ ), trust/optimism ( $\alpha = .72$ ), and anger/indignation ( $\alpha = .89$ ). Participants were asked to evaluate the extent to which they have experienced or not one of the above emotional situations during the last 12 months on a seven-point scale from 1 (*Never*) to 7 (*Always*). Greek participants were asked about their emotions towards financial crisis, French about social crisis, and English about BREXIT. Details for these scales are presented in Supplementary Materials.

**Personal relative deprivation.** The Personal Relative Deprivation Scale (Callan et al., 2011) was used to measure participants’ feelings about their outcomes relative to similar others. The scale ( $\alpha = .74$ ) included 5 statements such as «*I feel deprived when I think about what I have compared to what other people like me have*» (see Supplementary Materials for more details), and participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each one. The response scale ranged from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*).

**Political interest.** Political interest measurement based on Amna and Ekman’s (2014) concept and consisted of two questions: «*How interested are you in politics?*» and «*How interested are you in societal issues?*». The first one corresponded to the variable of “interest in politics”, while the second to the variable of “interest in societal issues”. Responses were given on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*Not Interested at All*) to 7 (*Extremely Interested*).

**Political participation.** Political participation consisted of 28 activities that correspond to traditional ( $\alpha = .67$ ), alternative ( $\alpha = .83$ ), and online ( $\alpha = .78$ ) forms (see Supplementary Materials for more details). Participants were asked how often they have done or not done any of the following activities based on a three-point scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 3 (*Yes, several times*).

**Political engagement status.** Participants were classified into one of the types of the reviewed typology based on the definition that they chose. More precisely, they were asked to read carefully a brief description of the different types that citizens choose to get engaged with politics and check the one that represents them the most:

- **Partisan engagement:** It refers to citizens who are interested and involved in political and societal issues, and they strongly support a political party and its policies.
- **Apartisan engagement:** It refers to citizens who are interested and involved in political and societal issues but they do not have constant ties or affiliation with a particular political party.
- **Stand-by engagement:** It refers to citizens who are interested in political and societal issues and prepared for political action only when they feel the need to intervene.

- ***Apolitical engagement***: It refers to citizens who are not interested or involved in political and societal issues.
- ***Anti-political engagement***: It refers to citizens who avoid politics and refuse to get involved in political and societal issues.

All descriptions consisted of the cognitive (political interest) and the behavioural (political participation) dimensions of the PE concept. The emotional dimension was not included because of the variety and complexity of the emotional spectrum. Consequently, this aspect is approached exclusively through the relevant set of questions (see above “Emotions”).

## Results

### *The structure of political participation*

The 28 different forms of political participation were subjected to a principal component analysis that yielded 6 factors (see Table 3). The first factor is named “*Non-digital Political Activism*” ( $\alpha = .78$ ) and includes 7 items. The second factor contains 8 items and is called “*Activities of Socio-political Concerns*” ( $\alpha = .85$ ). The third factor is named “*Digital Political Activism*” ( $\alpha = .72$ ) and incorporates 5 items. The next factor, “*Normative Collective Action*” ( $\alpha = .55$ ), contains four traditional forms of political participation. The last two factors are made up of 2 items and are named “*Active Political Counter-argumentation*” ( $r = .34$ ) and “*Pro-social Activism*” ( $r = .36$ ) respectively.

Furthermore, we examined the statistical equivalence across contexts by using a Multi-Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA). This specific evaluation was deemed necessary as the research is cross-cultural and respondents' perceptions of political participation may differ between the three contexts under investigation. As the three contexts have different political and cultural practices, it was considered possible that a common scale for investigating political participation might elicit non-equivalent responses, leading to non-invariant results. Therefore, independent models for each context and a common model for all participants were tested for invariance using MGCFA and all were acceptable regarding their overall goodness-of-fit indices (such as NLI, TLI, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR). The inspection of overall fit summaries, joint between models fit summaries and nested model comparisons established the extent of equivalence (see Table 4).

**Table 3.** *The Structure of Political Participation (Principal Components Analysis)*

<b>Forms of Political Participation</b>		<b>Factors</b>
4. Joining a union	.45	<b>Non-digital Political Activism (<math>\alpha = .78</math>)</b>
12. Painting political messages or graffiti on walls	.67	
15. Taking part in a political event where there is a confrontation with political opponents or the police	.63	
18. Donating money to support the work of a political group or movement	.50	
19. Occupying public and symbolic spaces and buildings	.66	
20. Distributing leaflets with a political content	.74	
21. Wearing a badge or a t-shirt with a political message or symbol	.51	
5. Taking part in a demonstration or strike	.61	<b>Activities of Socio-political Concerns (<math>\alpha = .85</math>)</b>
7. Attending a meeting concerned with political or societal issues	.50	
13. Protesting when someone outside my family has been unfairly treated	.67	
14. Taking part in concerts or a fundraising event with a political message	.57	
16. Listening to music that I think has a good political and societal message	.56	
17. Reading literature or poetry about politics or societal issues	.65	
26. Connecting to a group on Facebook (or the like) that is concerned with political or societal issues	.60	
27. Reading about politics in a blog or website	.63	<b>Digital Political Activism (<math>\alpha = .72</math>)</b>
22. Sending emails of political content	.49	
23. Participating to a political website or blog	.64	
24. Participating in an Internet-based protest	.66	
25. Writing about politics or societal issues on Facebook/twitter/blogs	.65	
28. Discussing societal or political issues with friends on the Internet	.56	<b>Normative Collective Action (<math>\alpha = .55</math>)</b>
1. Voting in general elections/referendum	.61	
2. Voting in the elections of a political party	.65	
3. Getting involved in a political party as a member	.65	
8. Contacting a politician or public official	.58	<b>Active Political Counter- argumentation (<math>r = .34</math>)</b>
6. Signing a petition	.76	
11. Boycotting or buying certain products for political, ethical, or environmental reasons	.60	<b>Pro-social Activism (<math>r = .36</math>)</b>
9. Working voluntarily for a good cause	.78	
10. Donating money to a good cause	.71	

**Table 4.** *MGCFA Results*

<b>Overall Model Fit</b>	<b>Total Data</b>	<b>GREEK</b>	<b>ENGLISH</b>	<b>FRENCH</b>
NFI	.809	.82	.818	.840
TLI	.980	.963	.942	.935
CFI	.833	.870	.88	.846
RMSA	.077	.078	.082	.077
Between Contexts Model Fit	<b>NFI</b>	<b>TLI</b>	<b>CFI</b>	<b>RMSA</b>
	.874	.906	.937	.051
<b>Nested Model Comparisons</b>				
<b>Assuming model Unconstrained to be correct:</b>		<b>DF</b>	<b>CMIN</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Measurement Weights		50	49.334937	.500
Measurement Intercepts		106	92.60745	.180
Structural Covariances		136	120.8336	.180
Measurement Residuals		192	194.30134	.560
<b>Assuming model Measurement weights to be correct:</b>		<b>DF</b>	<b>CMIN</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Measurement Intercepts		56	53.763316	.440
Structural Covariances		86	72.048976	.141
Measurement Residuals		142	125.89898	.170
<b>Assuming model Measurement weights to be correct:</b>		<b>DF</b>	<b>CMIN</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Structural Covariances		30	19.047875	.061
Measurement Residuals		86	69.4821054	.097
<b>Assuming model Measurement weights to be correct:</b>		<b>DF</b>	<b>CMIN</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Measurement Residuals		56	53.841721	.443

### ***Emotional, behavioural, and cognitive dimensions of political engagement***

Five models of logistic regression (one for each type of PE) were applied to our samples in order to investigate *Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5*. The five status of political engagement (partisan, apartisan, stand-by, apolitical, antipolitical) were employed as the criterion variables, whereas the emotional (emotions towards politics: enthusiasm, anxiety, aversion, disgust, disappointment, indifference; emotions towards crisis: fear/frustration, trust/optimism, anger/indignation), the cognitive (interest in politics, interest in societal issues), and the behavioural dimensions (political participation: non-digital political activism, activities of socio-political concerns, digital political activism, normative collective action, active political counter-argumentation, and pro-social activism) as predictors.

**Partisan engagement.** In Hypothesis 1, it was expected that partisan engagement would be predicted by enthusiasm towards politics and emotions of trust and optimism towards crises, as well as political interest, and political participation. A logistic regression model was performed to ascertain the main effects of the three sets of variables on the likelihood that participants develop a partisan engagement. The model was statistically significant [ $\chi^2(9, N = 88) = 4.794, p < .0001$ ] and explained 82.3% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in partisan engagement and correctly classified 73.5% of cases. As shown in Table 5, participants with increasing levels of enthusiasm and aversion towards politics, as well as normative collective action and digital political activism are associated with an increased likelihood of classifying into the partisan engagement (positive predictors). Note that due to simplicity reasons, in the following pages, we will present Odds Ratio (ExpB) in percentage. More precisely, enthusiasm increases the odds of partisan engagement by 51% (OR = 1.51, 95%CI [1.25, 1.84]), aversion by 34% (OR = 1.34, 95%CI [1.03, 1.73]), normative collective action by 165% (OR = 2.65, 95%CI [2.06, 3.42]), and digital political activism by 64% (OR = 1.64, 95%CI [1.31, 2.04]). However, increasing levels of interest in societal issues, indifference towards politics, and fear/frustration towards crises are linked with a reduction in the relevant odds. In other words, interest in societal issues reduces the odds by 33% (OR = .67, 95%CI [.55, .82]), indifference by 31% (OR = .69, 95%CI [.59, .81]), and fear/frustration by 20% (OR = .80, 95%CI [.63, 1.003]). Disappointment variable was excluded from the model as it was not statistically significant ( $p = .081$ ).

**Table 5.** *Partisan engagement predictors*

<b>Partisan Engagement</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>	<b>95% C.I. for</b>	
							<b>EXP(B)</b>	<b>EXP(B)</b>
Interest in Societal Issues	-.398	.103	14.949	1	.000	.672	.549	.822
Enthusiasm (Politics)	.415	.100	17.333	1	.000	1.514	1.245	1.841
Aversion (Politics)	.290	.132	4.859	1	.028	1.337	1.033	1.731
Indifference (Politics)	-.366	.080	20.814	1	.000	.694	.593	.812
Digital Political Activism	.493	.113	18.959	1	.000	1.637	1.311	2.044
Normative Collective Action	.976	.129	57.500	1	.000	2.654	2.062	3.415
Fear/Frustration (Crisis)	-.226	.117	3.739	1	.053	.797	.634	1.003

\*Note: Method=Backward Stepwise, Step 11

**Apartisan engagement.** For Hypothesis 2, we assumed that anxiety towards politics, anger/indignation towards crises, political interest, and political participation will predict apartisan engagement. To test this hypothesis, we run a logistic regression model that was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(9, N = 323) = 267.207, p < .0001$ . The model

explained 31.1% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in apartisan engagement and correctly classified 57.7% of cases. More precisely, increasing levels of interest in politics, activities of socio-political concerns and active political counter-argumentation are linked with increased likelihood of classifying into this type of engagement (positive predictors), while increasing levels of personal relative deprivation, trust/optimism towards crisis, as well as indifference and interest in societal issues are found as negative predictors (see Table 6). In other words, interest in politics increases the odds by 49% (OR = 1.49, 95%CI [1.30, 1.71]), activities of socio-political concerns by 22% (OR = 1.22, 95%CI [1.04, 1.43]), and active political counter-argumentation by 24% (OR = 1.24, 95%CI [1.07, 1.43]), while personal relative deprivation reduces it by 16% (OR = .84, 95%CI [.76, .94]), indifference by 15% (OR = .85, 95%CI [.78, .92]), interest in societal issues by 17% (OR = .83, 95%CI [.72, .95]), and trust/optimism by 14% (OR = .86, 95%CI [.76, .97]).

**Table 6.** *Apartisan engagement predictors*

Apartisan Engagement	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for	
							EXP(B)	
Interest in Politics	.402	.070	33.06	1	.000	1.495	1.303	1.714
Interest in Societal Issues	-.191	.072	7.021	1	.008	.826	.717	.951
Indifference (Politics)	-.167	.043	15.233	1	.000	.846	.778	.920
Activities of Socio-political Concerns	.198	.080	6.048	1	.014	1.219	1.041	1.427
Active Political Counter-argumentation	.216	.073	8.692	1	.003	1.242	1.075	1.434
Trust/Optimism (Crisis)	-.152	.061	6.145	1	.013	.859	.762	.969
Personal Relative Deprivation	-.171	.055	9.683	1	.002	.843	.757	.939

\*Note. Method=Backward Stepwise, Step 12

**Stand-by engagement.** In Hypothesis 3, it was expected that stand-by engagement will be predicted by anxiety towards politics, trust/optimism towards crises, political interest and political participation. For this type, the logistic regression model was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(9, N = 395) = 159.341, p < .0001$ . The model explained 19.5% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance and correctly classified 61.2% of cases. Increasing levels of trust/optimism towards crisis, as well as activities of socio-political concerns and active political counter-argumentation are found as positive predictors, whereas increasing levels of non-digital political activism, pro-social activism, digital political activism, normative collective action, enthusiasm (politics), and fear/frustration towards crisis are linked with a reduction in the likelihood of classifying into stand-by engagement (see Table 7). This means that trust/optimism increases the odds by 13%, (OR = 1.13, 95%CI [1.01, 1.26]), active political counter-argumentation by 15% (OR = 1.15, 95%CI [1, 1.33]), and activities of socio-political concerns by 23% (OR = 1.23, 95%CI [1.07, 1.41]) while non-digital political activism decreases the odds by 54%, (OR = .46, 95%CI [.36, .57]), digital political activism by 24%, (OR = .76, 95%CI [.65, .89]), normative collective action by 20%, (OR = .8, 95%CI [.67, .96]), pro-social activism by 13%, (OR = .76, 95%CI [.84, .99]), enthusiasm towards politics by 16% (OR = .84, 95%CI [.75, .94]), and fear/frustration towards crisis by 9% (OR = .91, 95%CI [.84, .98]).

**Table 7.** Stand-by engagement predictors

Stand-by Engagement	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)
Enthusiasm (Politics)	-.174	.057	9.249	1	.002	.840	.751 .940
Non-digital Political Activism	-.792	.117	46.092	1	.000	.453	.360 .569
Activities of Socio-political							
Concerns	.202	.071	8.156	1	.004	1.224	1.065 1.406
Digital Political Activism	-.280	.080	12.302	1	.000	.756	.647 .884
Normative Collective Action	-.223	.089	6.252	1	.012	.800	.672 .953
Active Political Counter-							
argumentation	.141	.072	3.851	1	.050	1.151	1.000 1.325
Pro-social Activism	-.141	.071	3.911	1	.048	.868	.755 .999
Fear/Frustration (Crisis)	-.098	.038	6.744	1	.009	.907	.842 .976
Trust/Optimism (Crisis)	.119	.056	4.461	1	.035	1.126	1.009 1.257

\*Note. Method=Backward Stepwise, Step 10

**Apolitical engagement.** For Hypothesis 4, we assumed that aversion and indifference towards politics along with fear/frustration towards crises will predict positively apolitical engagement, while political interest and political participation negatively. To test this hypothesis, we run a logistic regression model that was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(8, N = 173) = 915.126, p < .0001$ . The model explained 82% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in this kind of engagement and correctly classified 78.5% of cases (see Table 8). Increasing indifference towards politics, non-digital political activism, interest in societal issues, and personal relative deprivation are associated with an increase in the likelihood of classifying into the apolitical engagement (positive predictors), while increasing interest in politics and increasing levels of participation in activities of socio-political concerns, digital political activism, and active political counter-argumentation are linked with a reduction in the relevant likelihood. More precisely, personal relative deprivation increases the odds by 25% (OR = 1.25, 95%CI [1.05, 1.48]), indifference by 18% (OR = 1.18, 95%CI [1.02, 1.36]), non-digital political activism by 93% (OR = 1.93, 95%CI [1.41, 2.64]), and interest in societal issues by 27% (OR = 1.27, 95%CI [1.04, 1.55]), while interest in politics reduces the odds by 72% (OR = .28, 95%CI [.22, .36]), activities of socio-political concerns by 59%, (OR = .41, 95%CI [.29, .57]), digital political activism at 35%, (OR = .65, 95%CI [.45, .94]), and active political counter-argumentation by 31% (OR = .69, 95%CI [.52, .92]).

**Anti-political engagement.** In Hypothesis 5, it was expected that disgust and disappointment towards politics, personal relative deprivation, anger/indignation towards crises, and participation in political activities will be positive predictors of anti-political engagement, while political interest as a negative one. The logistic regression model was statistically significant [ $\chi^2(8, N = 26) = 1211.982, p < .0001$ ] and explained 93.4% (Nagelkerke  $R^2$ ) of the variance in anti-political engagement. However, due to the limited number of data, it was not able to calculate the classification accuracy. As shown in Table 9, increasing non-digital activism, digital political activism, pro-social activism, and activities of socio-political concerns are associated with increased likelihood of classifying into the anti-political engagement (positive predictors), while increasing levels of enthusiasm, as well as normative collective action, and interest in societal issues are linked with a reduction in the likelihood of classifying into the fifth type of engagement. This means that activities of socio-political concerns increase the relevant odds by 81% (OR = 1.81, 95%CI [1.18, 2.80]), non-digital political activism by 75% (OR = 1.75, 95%CI

[1.26, 2.44]), and digital political activism by 47% (OR = 1.47, 95%CI [1.01, 2.16]), whereas enthusiasm reduces the odds by 57% (OR = .43, 95%CI [.28, .66]), normative collective action by 43% (OR = .57, 95%CI [.34, .95]), and interest in societal issues by 41% (OR = .59, 95%CI [.49, .77]). Disgust towards politics and pro-social activism were excluded from the model as they were not statistically significant ( $p = .102$  and  $p = .08$  respectively).

**Table 8.** *Apolitical engagement predictors*

<b>Apolitical Engagement</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>	<b>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</b>	
Interest in Politics	-1.274	.131	95.178	1	.000	.28	.217	.361
Interest in Societal Issues	.239	.102	5.510	1	.019	1.27	1.04	1.551
Indifference (Politics)	.165	.072	5.221	1	.022	1.180	1.024	1.359
Non-digital Political Activism	.655	.160	16.714	1	.000	1.925	1.406	2.635
Activities of Socio-political								
Concerns	-.893	.166	28.793	1	.000	.409	.295	.567
Digital Political Activism	-.434	.191	5.144	1	.023	.648	.446	.943
Active Political Counter-argumentation	-.368	.145	6.455	1	.011	.692	.521	.919
Personal Relative Deprivation	.219	.088	6.220	1	.013	1.245	1.048	1.479

Note: Method=Backward Stepwise, Step 11

**Table 9.** *Anti-political engagement predictors*

<b>Anti-political Engagement</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>	<b>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</b>	
Interest in Societal Issues	-.531	.139	14.576	1	.000	.588	.448	.772
Enthusiasm (Politics)	-.854	.223	14.612	1	.000	.426	.275	.660
Activities of Socio-political								
Concerns	.596	.222	7.220	1	.007	1.814	1.175	2.802
Digital Political Activism	.387	.194	3.961	1	.047	1.473	1.006	2.156
Non-digital Political Activism	.562	.168	11.220	1	.001	1.754	1.263	2.438
Normative Collective Action	-.564	.261	4.665	1	.031	.569	.341	.949

\*Note. Method=Backward Stepwise, Step 11

## Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate the different aspects of PE, to explore the extent to which the suggested typology of PE (partisan, apartisan, stand-by, apolitical, anti-political) applies to young citizens (18-35 years old) in the UK, Greece and France, and to identify those variables that contribute to the appearance of each type. More specifically, it was an effort to better understand how developing crises and uncertainty challenge PE and how citizens cope with these challenges. PE was regarded as a complex concept that incorporates cognitive,

behavioural, and emotional aspects measured through political interest, political participation, and emotions toward politics and crises respectively. A principal component analysis helped us to regroup the various political activities measured in this study and yielded six factors (non-digital political activism, activities of socio-political concerns, digital political activism, normative collective action, active political counter-argumentation, pro-social activism) that were finally used as predictors in regression models.

The main results showed that different forms of political interest, different repertoires of political behaviours, and different sets of emotions contribute to the development of different types of PE. More precisely, we found that enthusiasm is a positive predictor for *partisan engagement*, whereas indifference towards politics and fear/frustration towards crises are negative predictors. These findings are relevant to the theory of affective intelligence (Marcus et al., 2006) according to which positive feelings elicit greater participation. In this case, participation is associated with normative collective action (voting, contacting a politician, partisanship, etc.) and digital political activism (e.g., participating in an Internet-based protest, writing about politics on social media) as they were also found among positive predictors. However, aversion towards politics also positively predicted this type of engagement. A possible explanation for this finding (supported by MacKuen et al., 2010) is that partisans pay selective attention to their political parties' agendas and ignore or limit their search for new perspectives and alternatives provided by political outgroups. Unexpected but consistent with this explanation is the variable of interest in societal issues that was found as a negative predictor for partisan engagement; interest might be limited and directed to pro-party sources and processes, and not to the whole political and social spectrum.

For *apartisan engagement*, interest in politics was a positive predictor. Apartisan participants seem to be attracted by politics and willing to pay attention to political phenomena rather than social matters (as indicated by the negative predictive value of interest in societal issues). They also manifest their political interest through activities of socio-political concerns (e.g., protesting when someone outside my family has been unfairly treated, reading literature or poetry about politics or societal issues) and active political counter-argumentation (such as signing a petition or boycotting) that were also found as positive predictors. These tendencies formulate their active engagement and differentiate them completely from partisans. Negative emotions (relative deprivation) or lack of emotions towards politics (indifference), as well as positive emotional reactions towards crises (trust/optimism) negatively predict this type of engagement. These findings can be seen as a set of mixed emotions towards politics and crises that also motivate the apartisan engagement, besides interest in politics and political participation.

Activities of socio-political concerns and active political counter-argumentation were also found as positive predictors for *stand-by engagement*, whereas almost all participatory forms (normative collective action, digital political activism, pro-social and non-digital political activism) as negative. In addition, emotions of trust and optimism towards crises positively predicted this type of engagement, contrary to fear/frustration (crises) and enthusiasm (politics). These findings are relevant to Chrysochoou, Papastamou, and Prodromitis's (2013) results which demonstrated that positive crisis-related emotions predict collective non-violent practices. Indeed, trust and optimism are associated with non-violent, artistic oriented (e.g., "reading literature/poetry about politics or societal issues") and consumerist (e.g., boycotting) practices that were both found among activities of socio-political concerns and active political counter-argumentation. None of the forms of political interest contributed to the prediction of this type of engagement, an element that clearly differentiates stand-by from apartisan engagement; stand-byers seem less interested in politics, but still, stay alert and open to crises-related stimuli.

Interest in politics negatively predicted *apolitical engagement*, while indifference towards politics positively. While genuine passivity to political issues could form a first impression of this type of engagement, considering the contribution of other variables makes this explanation inaccurate. More precisely, participants of apolitical engagement were found to experience high levels of personal relative deprivation and to choose non-digital

political activism as a participatory pattern instead of activities of socio-political concerns, digital political activism, and active political counter-argumentation (negative predictors). These findings open up the discussion for alternative considerations regarding apolitical engagement; citizens with a sense of being deprived of deserved outcomes cope with political challenges by avoiding political issues and rejecting mainstream forms of political participation (such as signing a petition or participating in a political website or blog). Still, they are interested in societal issues and stay active in civil society through various activities such as “painting political messages or graffiti on walls” or “wearing a badge or a t-shirt with a political message or symbol”. This indicates that they probably perceive themselves as apolitical (note that they chose apolitical engagement as the type of PE that represents them the most) but they stay emotionally and socially engaged through less conventional forms of participation. Another explanation that requires further investigation is whether the choice of apolitical engagement constitutes a response to the feelings of unfairness they experience.

Finally, *anti-political engagement* was predicted by non-digital political activism, activities of socio-political concerns, and digital activism. In addition, normative collective action and enthusiasm (that positively predicted partisan engagement) were found here as negative predictors along with interest in societal issues. These elements can be considered as a sign of fatigue and disillusionment towards politics and social matters that demand an active confrontation through participation in unions and social movements. In other words, anti-political participants seem to reject formal political activities and positive emotions towards politics, but they directly address social challenges and crises through their actions (such as “protesting when someone outside their family has been unfairly treated”, “writing about politics or societal issues”, “occupying public spaces and buildings” etc.). Like apolitical engagement, this type can be seen as an alternative form of PE.

Overall, we found that young citizens’ PE encompasses various emotions that coexist and interact with their decision for political action during uncertain times. The constructionist perspective supports the idea that emotions are largely shaped by shared social meanings (Thoits, 1989). Therefore, a key question is what are these shared social meanings that are communicated through the different types of PE? To start, it is important to recognise that each context has its own unique limitations and challenges that frame young citizens’ PE. According to Della Porta (2015), considering the specific characteristics of the socioeconomic, cultural and political context in which crises develop and social actors respond is essential for a comprehensive understanding. However, despite contextual differences (see “Socio-political Context” section), it is evident that young citizens across these three countries experience specific grievances, mostly socio-economic, that have an impact on their lives, leading to increased inequalities and individual or collective suffering. Furthermore, in Western societies, high levels of political discontent, disillusionment with the major institutions of representative democracy, and declining political trust have been observed over the last few decades (e.g., Amna & Ekman, 2014; Blais & Gélinau, 2007; Della Porta, 2012; Franklin, 2004; Putnam, 2000; Stoker, 2006).

One of the significant findings of our study is that emotions are pervasive in all types of PE, enhancing Jasper’s (1998) argument that emotions are part of our responses to events and shape the goals of our action or inaction. Additionally, another result indicates that different types of political interest and various forms of political participation appear in all types of PE. Combining contextual similarities mentioned above with these findings, PE types could be seen as either well-trodden paths or novel tracks, for political evolution and change. Partisans adhere to familiar routes of partisanship and partisan identification, whereas apartisans seem to choose the widespread trend of partisan (but not political) dealignment (Lipset & Rokkan, 1967), as they appear less connected to a particular party but keep their political voice up. Both types express their faith and dedication to the political process in order to promote their social and political demands, regardless of the different participatory patterns they adopt and the varying emotions they experience. The last three types of PE (stand-by, apolitical, and anti-political) could be regarded as unexplored avenues; they represent potential ways for

young citizens to express their discontent and distrust in established political institutions, or novel ways to provoke desired changes, or possibly both.

This study concludes that, in uncertain times, young citizens do engage with politics in multiple ways: they present different forms of political interest, they display a variety of emotions towards political and social matters, and they use numerous participatory patterns to act and react in contextual crises and political challenges. Young citizens' PE can be understood as a complex and dynamic process that encompasses cognitive, emotional, and behavioural aspects, while the typology of PE (partisan, apartisan, stand-by, apolitical, and anti-political) represents different levels and combinations of these elements.

Another important conclusion that emerged from this work is referred to apolitical engagement. Far from perceiving it as an apathetic and passive positioning, this choice is made by young citizens who experience feelings of unfairness, resentment, and dissatisfaction; they demonstrate no interest in politics, but they act through non-digital political activism. In other words, they are emotionally engaged and interested in societal issues, and they stay active through particular forms of participation in spite of the lack of political interest. Similarly, anti-political engagement is chosen by young citizens who feel no enthusiasm for politics; they are not interested in societal matters, but they still act through various ways such as digital activism, activities of socio-political concerns, and non-digital political activism that is linked with social and political movements, as well as unions. Based on the above observations, apolitical and anti-political types of engagement could be seen as potential political identities in "post-democratic" societies (Crouch, 2004) of developing crises where unfairness, lack of enthusiasm, and dissatisfaction towards mainstream institutions and politics push young citizens to adopt alternative paths.

Overall, this project tried to fill a gap in contemporary literature but also addressed issues outside of academia, in the political and social field, by offering a more thorough understanding of how different factors challenge PE and how young people cope with these challenges in uncertain times. On the one hand, our findings complement the current literature on young people's PE by challenging the usual negative perception of young citizens' political life and by offering alternative explanations on "notorious" terms such as apolitical or anti-political. On the other hand, the key point of the current findings lies in the fact that these terms incorporate a lack of enthusiasm and a sense of dissatisfaction and unfairness. Policy makers may benefit from such evidence as it indicates the need for effective and inclusive models that consider young citizens' grievances and difficulties in modern societies.

Our future research is going to further explore the PE typology. More specifically, we are going to identify the personal values (including Belief in a Just World), social factors (such as identification with parental political views), ideologies, and demographic traits (age, gender) that contribute to the appearance of each type, and to investigate potential similarities and differences between countries (UK, France, Greece).

In the end, some limitations of the current study should be mentioned. Firstly, the correlational nature of the study does not allow for causality inferences. Secondly, this project is limited to contexts of developing crises and, consequently, findings should not be generalised to other contexts. Thirdly, this project was conducted during quarantine (October 2020 - February 2021) due to the covid-19 pandemic when strict measures of isolation were implemented and participatory activities declined. For this purpose, we asked participants to specify how often they have or have not done a set of 28 activities without framing any particular period of time (e.g., during the last 12 months). A specified time frame could provide more accurate responses and minimize potential biases.

We hope that the present work contributes to the literature by proposing alternative interpretations of young citizens' PE and that it offers fruitful ground for further discussion and inquiry on what is perhaps misinterpreted as young people's political passivity.

## Acknowledgements -Funding

This research is co-financed by Greece and the European Union (European Social Fund- ESF) through the Operational Programme «Human Resources Development, Education and Lifelong Learning» in the context of the project "Reinforcement of Postdoctoral Researchers - 2nd Cycle" (MIS-5033021), implemented by the State Scholarships Foundation (IKY).



## References

- Adam-Troian, J., Mahfud, Y., Urbanska, K., & Guimond, S. (2021). The role of social identity in the explanation of collective action: An intergroup perspective on the Yellow Vests movement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 51*(6), 560–576. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12757>
- Amna, E., & Ekman, J. (2014). Standby citizens: Diverse faces of political passivity. *European Political Science Review, 6*, 261–281. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s175577391300009x>
- Barrett, M., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2014). Political and civic engagement and participation: Towards an integrative perspective. *Journal of Civil Society, 10*(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2013.871911>
- Blais, A., Gidengil, E., Nevitte, N., & Nadeau, R. (2004). Where does turnout decline come from? *European Journal of Political Research, 43*, 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2004.00152.x>
- Blais, A., & Gélinau, F. (2007). Winning, losing, and satisfaction with democracy. *Political Studies, 55* (2), 425–441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00659.x>
- Brady, H. (1999). Political participation. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of political attitudes*, (pp. 737–801). Academic Press.
- Callan, M. J., Kim, H., Gheorghiu, A. I., & Matthews, W. J. (2017). The interrelations between social class, personal relative deprivation, and prosociality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 8*(6), 660–669. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616673877>
- Callan, M. J., Shead, N. W., & Olson, J. M. (2011). Personal relative deprivation, delay discounting, and gambling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(5), 955–973. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024778>
- Carreras, M. (2016). Compulsory voting and political engagement (beyond the ballot box): A multilevel analysis. *Electoral Studies, 43*, 158–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2016.04.005>
- Chrysochoou, X., Papastamou, S., & Prodromitis, G. (2013). Facing the economic crisis in Greece: The effects of grievances, real and perceived vulnerability, and emotions towards the crisis on reactions to austerity measures. *Journal of Social Science Education, 12*(1), 41–49. <https://doi.org/10.4119/jsse-633>
- Crosby, F. (1976). A model of egoistical relative deprivation. *Psychological Review, 83*(2), 85–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.83.2.85>
- Crouch, C. (2004). *Post-Democracy*. Polity Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (1996). *Citizen politics* (2nd ed.). Chatham House.
- Dalton, R. J. (2013). *The apartisan American: Dealignment and changing electoral politics*. CQ Press.
- Della Porta, D. (2015). *Social movements in times of austerity: Bringing capitalism back into protest analysis*. Polity Press.
- Della Porta, D. (2012). Critical trust : Social movements and democracy in times of crisis. *Cambio, 2* (4), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.13128/cambio-19432>

- Delli Carpini, M., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. Yale University Press.
- Dostie-Goulet, E. (2009). Social networks and the development of political interest. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12(4), 405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260902866512>
- Ekman, J., & Amna, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. Engaged citizens? Political participation and social engagement among youth, women, minorities and migrants. *Human Affairs*, 22(3), 283-300. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1>
- Emler, N. (2011). What does it take to be a political actor in a multicultural society? In M. Barrett, C. Flood, J. Eade (Eds), *Nationalism, ethnicity, citizenship: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 135-162). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Franklin, M. (2004). *Voter turnout and the dynamics of electoral competition in established democracies since 1945*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hay, C., & Stoker, G. (2009). Revitalising politics: Have we lost the plot. *Representation: The Journal of Representative Democracy*, 45(3), 225-236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344890903129681>
- Hobolt, S.B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(9), 1259-1277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2016.1225785>
- Jasper, J. M. (1998). The emotions of protest: Affective and reactive emotions in and around social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 13(3), 397-424. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022175308081>
- Kaase, M., & Marsh, A. (1979). Political action: A theoretical perspective. In S.H. Barnes (Ed.), *Political action: Mass participation in five western democracies* (pp. 27-56). Sage.
- Karageorgou, K., Madoglou, A., & Kalamaras, D., (2018). Social representations of "apolitical people" among different citizenship styles of Greek youth. *Papers on Social Representations*, 27 (1), 5.1-22.
- Karageorgou, K., (2019). *Apolitical Citizens in Contemporary Greek Society: A Sociopsychological Approach*. [Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Psychology, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences]. Εθνικό Αρχείο Διδακτορικών Διατριβών. <https://doi.org/10.12681/eadd/45548>
- Levy, B.L.M., & Akiva, T. (2019). Motivating political participation among youth: An analysis of factors related to adolescents' political engagement. *Political Psychology*, 40(5), 1039-1055. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12578>
- Lipset, S. M., & Rokkan, S. (1967). *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*. Free Press.
- Lupia, A., & Philpot, T. S. (2005). Views from inside the net: How websites affect young adults' political interest. *Journal of Politics*, 67(4), 1122-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2005.00353.x>
- MacKuen, M., Wolak, J., Keele, L., & Marcus, G. (2010). Civic engagements: Resolute partisanship or reflective deliberation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(2), 440-458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2010.00440.x>
- Marcus, G. E. (2000). Emotions in politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 221-250. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.3.1.221>
- Marcus, G. E., MacKuen, M., Wolak, J., & Keele, L. (2006). The measure and mismeasure of emotion. In David Redlawsk (ed.), *Feeling politics: Emotion in political information processing*, (pp. 31-45). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marcus, G. E., Neuman, W., & MacKuen, M. (2000). *Affective intelligence and political judgment*. University of Chicago Press.
- McCartney, A.R.M. (2013). Teaching civic engagement: Debates, definitions, benefits, and challenges. In A. R. M. McCartney, E. A. Bennion, & D. W. Simpson, (Eds), *Teaching civic engagement: From student to active citizen* (pp. 9-20). American Political Science Association.
- Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. Cambridge University Press.

- Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pontes, A., Henn, M., & Griffiths, M. (2018). Towards a conceptualization of young people's political engagement: A qualitative focus group study. *Societies*, 8(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8010017>
- Prati, F., Pratto, F., Zeineddine, F., Sweetman, J., Aiello, A., Petrovic, N., & Rubini, M. (2022). From social dominance orientation to political engagement: The role of group status and shared beliefs in politics across multiple contexts. *Political Psychology*, 43(1), 153-175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12745>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Schudson, M. (1996). What if civic life didn't die? *The American Prospect*, 25, 17-20.
- Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American public life*. Free Press.
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., & Bialosiewicz, S. (2012). Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(3), 203-232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868311430825>
- Stoker, G. (2006). *Why politics matters: making democracy work*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Theocharis, Y., de Moor, J., & van Deth, J. W. (2019). Digitally networked participation and lifestyle politics as new modes of political participation. *Policy and Internet*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.231>
- Thoits, P. A. (1989). The sociology of the emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 317-342. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.15.080189.001533>
- Vasilopoulou, S., & Halikiopoulou D. (2015). Greek politics : Economim crisis or crisis of democracy? *World Affairs*, 178 (3), 13-19.
- Verba, S., & Nie, N. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality*. Harper & Row.
- Walker, I., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1984). Relative deprivation theory: An overview and conceptual critique. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23(4), 301-310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1984.tb00645.x>

## ΕΜΠΕΙΡΙΚΗ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ | RESEARCH PAPER

# Διερευνώντας τις συναισθηματικές, συμπεριφορικές και γνωστικές διαστάσεις της πολιτικής εμπλοκής των νέων σε περιόδους αβεβαιότητας

Κατερίνα ΚΑΡΑΓΕΩΡΓΟΥ<sup>1</sup>, Άννα ΜΑΝΤΟΓΛΟΥ<sup>1</sup>, Δημήτρης ΚΑΛΑΜΑΡΑΣ<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Τμήμα Ψυχολογίας, Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών και Πολιτικών Επιστημών

ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΚΛΕΙΔΙΑ	ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ
Πολιτική εμπλοκή Συναισθήματα Πολιτικό ενδιαφέρον Πολιτική συμμετοχή Αβεβαιότητα Νέοι πολίτες	<p>Η πολιτική εμπλοκή (ΠΕ) προσεγγίζεται ως ένας σύνθετος όρος που ενσωματώνει τη γνωστική, τη συμπεριφορική και τη συναισθηματική διάσταση. Στόχος της παρούσας έρευνας είναι να διερευνήσει την προτεινόμενη τυπολογία ΠΕ (κομματική, μη κομματικοποιημένη, εν αναμονή, απολίτικη, αντιπολιτική) και να προσδιορίσει εκείνες τις μεταβλητές (γνωστικές, συναισθηματικές, συμπεριφορικές) που συμβάλλουν στην εμφάνιση κάθε τύπου. Οι έρευνες πραγματοποιήθηκαν σε τρεις χώρες (Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, Γαλλία, Ελλάδα) καθώς καθεμία από αυτές αντιπροσωπεύει και βιώνει μια διαφορετική μορφή κρίσης. Τα άτομα που συμμετείχαν στην έρευνα (N=1.005, από 18 έως 35 ετών) ταξινομήθηκαν σε έναν από τους τύπους ΠΕ βάσει της αυτό-τοποθέτησης τους στην αντίστοιχη τυπολογία. Έπειτα εφαρμόστηκαν πέντε μοντέλα λογιστικής παλινδρόμησης για καθέναν από τους τύπους ΠΕ. Οι πέντε τύποι αποτέλεσαν τις μεταβλητές κριτήρια, ενώ η συναισθηματική (συναισθήματα για την πολιτική: ενθουσιασμός, άγχος, αποστροφή, αηδία, απογοήτευση, αδιαφορία: συναισθήματα για την κρίση: φόβος/ματαίωση, εμπιστοσύνη/αισιοδοξία, θυμός/αγανάκτηση), η γνωστική (πολιτικό ενδιαφέρον: ενδιαφέρον για την πολιτική, ενδιαφέρον για κοινωνικά θέματα) και η συμπεριφορική διάσταση (πολιτική συμμετοχή: μη-διαδικτυακός πολιτικός ακτιβισμός, δραστηριότητες κοινωνικο-πολιτικού ενδιαφέροντος, διαδικτυακός πολιτικός ακτιβισμός, κανονιστική συλλογική δράση, ενεργητική πολιτική αντιπεριχειρηματολογία, φιλοκοινωνικός ακτιβισμός) χρησιμοποιήθηκαν ως προβλεπτικοί παράγοντες. Τα αποτελέσματα έδειξαν ότι διαφορετικά είδη πολιτικού ενδιαφέροντος, διαφορετικά μοτίβα πολιτικής συμμετοχής και διαφορετικοί συνδυασμοί συναισθημάτων συμβάλλουν στην εμφάνιση του κάθε τύπου ΠΕ. Επιπλέον, οι τύποι ΠΕ ερμηνεύονται μέσα από την περιπλοκότητα των σύγχρονων κοινωνιών. Ειδικότερα για την απολίτικη και την αντιπολιτική ΠΕ, προτείνεται να ιδωθούν ως μορφές πολιτικής ταυτότητας στις μεταδημοκρατικές κοινωνίες των αναπτυσσόμενων κρίσεων και της αβεβαιότητας.</p>
ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ ΕΠΙΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΣ	
Κατερίνα Καραγεώργου Τμήμα Ψυχολογίας, Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κοινωνικών και Πολιτικών Επιστημών Λεωφόρος Συγγρού 136, 17671 Αθήνα Ελλάδα <a href="mailto:aik.karageorgou@panteion.gr">aik.karageorgou@panteion.gr</a>	