Evaluation of an Active Citizenship Intervention Based on Youth-Led Participatory Action Research

31 December 2024

Evaluation of an Active Citizenship Intervention Based on Youth-Led Participatory Action

Research

Abstract

Youth-led Participatory Action Research (YPAR) is a theoretical-methodological approach that has been designed to promote positive development (e.g., well-being and health, social-emotional and cognitive development, academic or career advancement) and civic engagement among young people. Although YPAR holds particular promise, there has been little systematic assessment of its effects. Moreover, no study has investigated the role of YPAR in the promotion of active citizenship. We report on an effectiveness evaluation of a YPAR project designed to promote European active citizenship (i.e., identification and attitudes toward a political entity, institutional trust, participation, and political alienation) and social well-being among adolescents. Our sample included 69 Italian high school students (35 in the intervention group; 34 in the control group). We evaluated the impact of YPAR using a pretest-posttest control group design and fitting the generalized estimating equations procedure. The results showed that participants in the intervention group reported increased scores on social well-being, institutional trust, and participation and decreased scores on political alienation compared to the control group. We found no significant effects for identification as European and attitudes toward a political entity. Findings support the benefits of YPAR in terms of social well-being and active citizenship.

Keywords: participatory action research, youth, high school students, intervention, active citizenship, Europe

Evaluation of an Active Citizenship Intervention Based on Youth-Led Participatory Action

Research

In this paper we focus on Youth-Led Participatory Action Research (YPAR), a

theoretical-methodological approach used in developmental, educational, public health and

community psychology to enhance young people empowerment and civic engagement as well as

positive youth development (Anyon, Bender, Kennedy, & Dechants, 2018; Ozer, 2017;

Rodriguez & Brown, 2009). Indeed, Eccles and Gootman (2002) provided strong theoretical

rationale that YPAR could improve positive youth development. YPAR is a form of community-

based participatory research in which young people are trained to identify and analyze (through

research) issues relevant to their lives, report to relevant stakeholders, and advocate for solutions

or influence policies and decisions (Cammarota & Fine, 2008; London, Zimmerman, & Erbstein,

2003; Ozer, 2017; Rodriguez & Brown, 2009). Ozer and Douglas (2015) identified several core

processes and key features of YPAR. Core processes of YPAR include youth-adult partnerships

with the aim of identifying social issues and conducting research to investigate their nature, the

practice of critical reflection and discussing strategies for social change, and building of

supportive networks and alliances with stakeholders. In addition, according to Ozer, Ritterman,

and Wanis (2010, p. 153), key features of a YPAR involve "an emphasis on promoting youth's

sense of ownership and control over the process, and promoting the social and political

engagement of youth and their allies to help address problems identified in the research."

Evaluation of the Effects of YPAR

In view of their characteristics, YPAR projects offer developmental opportunities for

youth and, therefore, may well promise success in fostering positive development and civic

engagement within schools and communities. However, as argued by Ozer (2017) there is, as

yet, small empirical literature assessing the developmental benefits of YPAR projects for young

people (Jacquez, Vaughn, & Wagner, 2013; Ozer, 2017). Three reviews of youth participatory

action research found some evidence that participation in YPAR was associated with

improvements in health and well-being, agency and leadership, social-emotional, interpersonal,

and cognitive development, academic or career outcomes, connectedness with community, and

critical consciousness (Anyon et al., 2018; Jacquez et al., 2013; Shamrova & Cummings, 2017).

In part due to the difficulties of arranging complex YPAR projects in controlled settings, only

few published studies have evaluated the benefits of YPAR using a standard quasi-experimental

approach including a control group, using in most cases other types of methods such as

qualitative participatory evaluation research (Anyon et al., 2018; Ozer, 2017). A control group is

important to draw strong inferences about the benefits from the participation in YPAR projects[1].

Indeed, in their systematic review of YPAR, Anyon et al. (2018, p. 875) concluded as follows:

"practitioners need to be open to evaluation designs that involve a comparison group of youth

who are not participating in the program." The benefits of a systematic assessment are numerous.

At the most fundamental level, a systematic assessment of YPAR helps scientists and

practitioners identify the strengths and weaknesses of such intervention, develop

recommendations and lessons learned, and highlight future challenges and directions.

  To our knowledge, only a few studies used a control group of youth who did not

participate in YPAR. Specifically, these studies revealed that, compared to a control group,

youth who participated in YPAR reported benefits in terms of social influence, perceived

---

[1] In response to an anonymous reviewer's comment, here we do not argue that the use of a control group is the only way to draw strong inferences about the benefits from YPAR. More important, we want to make clear that we are not devaluating previous scholarship that did not use a control group. Indeed, there are different research methods and designs that are important and can offer significant understanding of intervention benefits.

control, empathy, and self-efficacy for protection of family (Wallerstein, Sanchez, & Velarde,

2004), reductions in marijuana use (Berg, Coman, & Schensul, 2009), psychological

empowerment (Ozer & Douglas, 2013). Finally, a recent study evaluated the effectiveness of the

Youth Empowerment Solutions program which shares similar features with YPAR (Zimmerman

et al., 2018). Results showed that young people who could be involved in more activities and

were able to experience more components of the curriculum reported less antisocial outcomes

and more prosocial outcomes and psychological empowerment than youth included in the control

condition receiving fewer of the intervention components.

　　　　Taken together, these findings suggest that YPAR represents a promising approach to

produce change on a set of skills and outcomes related to youth development and well-being as

well as the development of civic engagement. However, more research is needed to answer

questions about the magnitude of change in the expected developmental outcomes produced by

YPAR projects. Moreover, to our knowledge, the published studies that have included a control

group in their evaluation of YPAR were conducted in North America. Research is needed in

other cultural settings such as the European countries.

Goals of the Present Study

　　　　The goal of the present study was to evaluate the impact of a two-years active citizenship

intervention based on YPAR on Italian high school students. Our research sought to address two

major gaps in the literature: (1) to evaluate the impact of YPAR intervention using a control

group in a context outside of North America and (2) to design a YPAR intervention to

prospectively address active citizenship in the EU given the current political context. While we

have already pointed out the need to document the effect of YPAR using a control group in

European countries, in this paragraph we want to discuss the importance of using YPAR to address active citizenship in the EU.

The notion of active citizenship has been introduced some decades ago (Bee, 2017; Crick & Lockyer, 2010; Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009; Motti-Stefanidi & Cicognani, 2018; Ross, 2007; Stevenson, Dixon, Hopkins, & Luyt, 2015) and has inspired youth policies and youth citizenship education initiatives. The construct of active citizenship is part of a much larger strand of research into civic engagement and participation (Barrett & Zani, 2015; Heggart, 2015; Pospieszna & Galus, 2018; Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010). Moreover, there is evidence that suggests a link between adolescents' and adults' civic engagement and participation (Campbell, 2008; Stevenson et al., 2015). Hoskins and Mascherini (2009, p. 462) defined active citizenship as follows: "Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy." This definition and its conceptual model have been widely used, also because it made a significant effort to develop indicators to facilitate comparisons across EU countries. However, it has been also criticized for its normative and value-based assumptions (e.g. about who is a "good EU citizen" and his/her expected forms of democratic participation) that might fail to capture the full variety of forms of social and political engagement, including the critical ones, that young people (may) use to voice expectations and concerns.

In the present study, we use a definition of adolescent active European citizenship "that encompasses two interrelated dimensions: while psychological citizenship refers to one's cognitive and affective ties to some political community, participatory practices refer to one's active involvement within this community (Šerek & Jugert, 2018, p. 303). Specifically, the perspective that guided the current intervention considers active citizenship as including a set of

interrelated components and dimensions, such as participation in social and political life, and

psychological orientations like positive attitudes and identification with political institutions,

feelings of efficacy and competence in engaging with social and political issues (e.g., low

political alienation), and institutional trust (Antonini, Hogg, Mannetti, Barbieri, & Wagoner,

2015; Henn & Foard, 2012; Motti-Stefanidi & Cicognani, 2018; Šerek & Jugert, 2018; Sindic,

2011; Theiss-Morse, 1993). Such dimensions of active citizenship are of great importance since

a sense of transnational political identity that transcends national boundaries is an important

prerequisite for the process of European integration (Fuchs & Klingemann, 2011; Medrano &

Gutiérrez, 2001; Postelnicescu, 2016; Stoeckel, 2016). Indeed, the European project and idea

(i.e., the establishment of a truly European community) are increasingly threatened by the rise of

nationalistic parties and leaders that express strong anti-European sentiment and desire to shift

power back to the nation states (Postelnicescu, 2016). Given the socio-cultural context in the

European Union (EU), we believe that a definition of active EU citizenship should include

attitudes and institutional trust toward the EU, consistent with the notion of "active citizenship"

(e.g., Barrett & Zani, 2015; Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009; Motti-Stefanidi & Cicognani, 2018;

Ross, 2007; Šerek & Jugert, 2018).

Trust is also conceptualized as related to community involvement and political

participation (Antonini et al., 2015; Boeckmann & Tyler, 2002; Henn & Foard, 2012). Civic and

political participation in a community is a core aspect of active citizenship (e.g., Barrett & Zani,

2015; Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009; Motti-Stefanidi & Cicognani, 2018; Ross, 2007; Šerek &

Jugert, 2018). The EU can be seen as an example of community including member states.

Therefore, we have included attitudes, trust and civic and political participation as indicators of

EU active citizenship.

Among the indicators of EU active citizenship, we have chosen identification as European because conceptions of citizenship and participation relate to that of identities (Antonini et al., 2015) and this is especially true in the case of European identity and citizenship (Ross, 2007). The Treaty of Maastricht introduced the notion of 'a citizenship of the Union', a form of supranational identity. This supranational nationality, paralleling a multiple identity, allows European citizens to identify with both the EU and their own national state (Landberg et al., 2018). Therefore, a definition of EU active citizenship should also consider identification as European. Finally, conceptualizations of active citizenship focus on alienation and apathy as factors that inhibit citizen participation, in particular among youth (Henn & Weinstein, 2006; Marsh, O'Toole, & Jones, 2007; Motti-Stefanidi & Cicognani, 2018; Newell & Davis, 1988; Sindic, 2011; Theiss-Morse, 1993; Tilly, 2007). Therefore, we have included political alienation among the aspects that feature active citizenship.

A YPAR project promotes processes that are psychologically and politically empowering (Ozer, 2017) and, as such, is considered a useful approach to promote well-being (e.g., Christens, 2012; Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2005; Molix & Bettencourt, 2010; Smith, Beck, Bernstein, & Dashtguard, 2014). In addition, YPAR has been conceptualized as "an innovative, equity-focused approach for promoting adolescent health and well-being" (Ozer, 2017, p. 173). Indeed, YPAR interventions are expected to enhance active citizenship dimensions and to contribute also to positive youth developmental outcomes such as social well-being (Anyon et al., 2018; Jacquez et al., 2013; Shamrova & Cummings, 2017). Therefore, we have chosen well-being among the youth-level outcomes of YPAR. Specifically, we have chosen social well-being (Keyes, 1998, 2004) because it includes aspects such as the perception of membership to a community, of mattering to other people, trust in people generally and a positive view of the broader society.

These aspects that define the experience of social well-being are particularly relevant for our intervention aimed at fostering active citizenship.

Our main focus was on the investigation of the effectiveness of YPAR in enhancing active citizenship and social well-being. Specifically, we were interested in a set of outcomes that reflect active citizenship at the EU level: identification as European, institutional trust, political alienation, participation at the EU level, and attitudes toward the EU. These outcomes were chosen because the YPAR that we have developed was focused on the European level. Our hypotheses were that participation in our citizenship intervention based on YPAR would be associated with increased levels of European active citizenship indicators and social well-being.

There is evidence of differences in participation (e.g., civic engagement) between ethnic majority and minority groups[2] among Italian youth (e.g., Cicognani, Albanesi, Mazzoni, Prati, & Zani, 2016). Therefore, ethnicity may relate to active citizenship. To account for any effects of ethnicity on active citizenship, comparisons were made between the intervention and control groups for ethnicity and socioeconomic status in addition to sex and age.

Method

Intervention Program

We have rooted our active citizenship intervention based on YPAR in the theories of sociopolitical development and empowerment (Wallerstein et al., 2004; Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman, Stewart, Morrel-Samuels, Franzen, & Reischl, 2010) as well as the theory of Freire (1970) about the banking and problem posing concept of education. Moreover, we based our intervention on the principles of youth-adult partnerships as a strategy to build knowledge by

---

[2] We recognize that mean differences in civic participation is more nuanced than just minority and majority groups; however, the discussion is out of the scope of this article.

selecting, researching, and addressing social issues (Anyon et al., 2018). We developed and implemented a small-scale YPAR intervention in an Italian high school. The aim of this intervention was to involve students in a practical experience of participatory action research focusing on concrete social issues that young people identified as relevant in their own lives and for other people in their local community and having a European dimension (e.g., that could be experienced as relevant also by people in other countries). Indeed, the intervention also aimed at involving young people in elaborating possible strategies to address the selected issues, either individually or collectively, by eliciting solutions from political institutions.

Consistent with the YPAR premises, the role of adult facilitators was played by two teachers with the supervision of community psychologists. Students decided the topic and the methods to collect data to be used; they also decided how to share the data with the local community. The adults that were working with students were teachers and community psychologists who are very familiar with YPAR methodology. Teachers received training on the YPAR method and principles, in two days of international workshops where they were also provided some guidelines with practical examples and references. The adults supported the participants to proceed through the process, but the responsibility for the students' work at each stage was basically in their own hands. In more concrete terms, the intervention, which lasted two years, was integrated with regular curricular activities. Such intervention was part of the activities of a work-based learning in Italy that is named 'Alternanza Scuola lavoro' — school–work alternation (Indire, 2019)— which is mandatory for all students in Italian high schools. This choice allowed us to dedicate about 100 hours of work for each year, for a total of around 200 hours for the whole intervention. Participants in the control group were enrolled in

educational courses that integrated the school curriculum with the workplace within the framework of the school-work alternation.

The first year of the intervention started in October 2016 and lasted till April 2017, while the second year lasted from October 2017 to May 2018. In the first year, students were involved in YPAR in the phases of identifying social issues located in their community, mapping and understanding the social issues, sharing findings with stakeholders in their local community and with students and researchers at international level (at the H2020 project's conference).

During the first year of the intervention, participants

(1) detected some significant social issues in their local community;

(2) mapped social issues based on their personal interest and the concrete opportunities to conduct an interesting and original research;

(3) identified four issues at local level: poverty, immigration, environmental issues, and drug abuse;

(4) attended courses on the web and bibliographic research and on videos production;

(5) collected both qualitative and quantitative data about each social issue (i.e., face-to-face interviews, questionnaires, and on-site visits);

(6) contacted representatives of local organizations addressing the selected social issues;

(7) worked on report and presentations;

(8) presented their work and their findings (presentation, documents, and audio-visual materials) at the first international conference of the project as well as in a public meeting with the local community.

After the first year, a phase of reflection allowed students to understand how the social issues identified at local level could be addressed on a transnational level, specifically on

European level. This phase of the intervention emphasized the social role of the EU in

participants' everyday life and enhanced participants' active political and social engagement at

the EU level. This phase allowed participants to increase their critical awareness of the role the

EU plays or potentially could play, in addressing social issues located in their community. For

instance, participants developed a critical awareness of the efforts of the EU in promoting

common migration policies as well as in dealing with illegal migration. We should also consider

that the social role of the EU in their everyday life in addressing the social issues has been a

central part of the activities of the second year.

In the second year, to support students' reflection, students participated in the phases of

mapping and understanding the social issues at EU level, developing proposals for EU

institutions and sharing proposals with representatives of institutions, international students, and

teachers. Specifically, participants:

(1) developed a critical awareness of the structure and the functioning of European

institutions with the guidance of adult facilitators such as European professors of the H2020

consortium as well as an Italian representative of the European Parliament;

(2) collected data at the European level by contacting representatives of European

institutions regarding the specific issue to shift the focus to the European level. An online

platform was prepared to share research material between students and discuss the different

perspectives on social issues with students coming from other countries;

(3) contacted EU organizations and representatives to manage how to address the social

issue at EU level with the support of the teachers and researchers;

(4) provided ideas for intervention/solution for the EU institutions;

(5) attended as main protagonists the H2020 project final conference in Brussels to share

and discuss their proposals with representatives of the EU institutions, by interacting with

politicians, public officials, and peers from other European countries.

Measures

We administered a questionnaire including measures of active citizenship at the EU level

and social well-being. The questionnaire sought also to obtain background information (e.g.,

gender and age) about participants. Before doing the analyses, we checked the unidimensionality

of the following scales using factor analysis (results are also available upon request from the first

author).

Identification as European. We used a three-item scale of identification as European

derived from previous research among youth populations (e.g., Mazzoni et al., 2018; Prati,

Cicognani, & Mazzoni, 2019): "I feel strong ties toward Europe," "Being European gives me

self-confidence," and "I am proud to be European." Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly*

disagree) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Good internal consistency was found both at pre-test ($\alpha = .79$)

and post-test ($\alpha = .83$).

Attitudes toward the EU. We used a semantic differential scale derived from previous

research among youth populations (e.g., Prati et al., 2019). We asked participants to choose

where their position lies concerning the EU, on a scale of five points, between each of the

following bipolar adjectives: competent/incompetent, efficient/inefficient, warm/cold,

friendly/unfriendly, just/unjust, and fair/unfair. Cronbach's alpha was acceptable both at pre-test

($\alpha = .78$) and post-test ($\alpha = .66$).

Political alienation. We used four items (e.g., "It does not matter who wins the European

elections, the interests of ordinary people do not matter" and "People like me do not have

opportunities to influence the decisions of the European Union") derived from previous research among youth populations (e.g., Dahl et al., 2018; Parksepp, 2017). Each item was scored on a 5-point scale using anchors of 1: *Strongly disagree* and 5: *Strongly agree*. Cronbach's alpha was satisfactory both at pre-test (α = .80) and post-test (α = .82).

Institutional trust. We used a two-item scale of institutional trust derived from a previous study involving young people (Dahl et al., 2018). We asked respondents to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the two items representing trust toward political institutions (e.g., *I trust the European Union*). Response options ranged from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). The Spearman-Brown coefficient was .70 at pre-test and .57 at post-test.

Participation at EU level. We used the Civic and Political Participation scale (CPP scale; Enchikova et al., 2019). This scale has been deemed valid for use among youth populations (Enchikova et al., 2019). The CPP scale includes 18 questions that cover conventional and non-conventional types of civic and political participation at the EU level, such as political actions, protest activities, economic actions, civic volunteering, expression of personal opinion offline and online. The questions included two response categories: *No* (coded as 0) and *Yes* (coded as 1). We summarized items to create an indicator of civic and political participation. Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) coefficient of reliability was .68 at pre-test and .91 at post-test.

Social well-being. We used the social well-being scale (Keyes, 1998; Keyes et al., 2008; Petrillo, Capone, Caso, & Keyes, 2015). The social well-being scale has been deemed valid for use among youth populations (Cicognani et al., 2008). It should be noted that we dropped one (i.e., "That you had something important to contribute to society") of the five items from the social well-being scale because it represents the construct definition for social contribution which is closely related to political alienation. To avoid the risk of multicollinearity, we excluded this

item. Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Results suggest

that the scale was satisfactorily internally consistent both at pre-test ($\alpha = .78$) and post-test ($\alpha =$

.81).

Procedure and Participants

We obtained ethical approval from the Ethics Committee of our Institution. Written

informed consent was obtained from both the participants and the parents or guardians of

participants. Researchers contacted the Principal of one public high school located in the north of

Italy. The Principal agreed to involve students from the school in this intervention and identified

four classes in the $10^{th}/11^{th}$ grade which were similar in terms of school curriculum and number

of students. The rationale behind this choice was that the same students were still at school at the

end of the two-year intervention. Concerning the selection of the control classes, the principal

was given the following criteria: a comparable class in terms of age, gender and number of

students (and similar concerning overall performance, meaning that the control classes should

not stand out both in positive and negative terms regarding performance, behavioral problems,

etc.). The teachers were selected among those who were teaching in the intervention group.

Criteria for selection were the following: having sufficient fluency in English and not being

involved in another mobility program with their classes. The school is usually involved in

three/four international projects per school year (e.g., Erasmus+ EU program), involving both

students and teachers. The two teachers that matched the criteria for selection were approached

by the Principal and they agreed to participate in the project.

Participants in both control and intervention groups were asked to fill out the same

questionnaire before the intervention (at the beginning of the first year) and at the end of the

intervention (at the end of the second year). The intervention group was involved in a citizenship

intervention based on YPAR and the control group students attended regular school activities during the same time.

At baseline, participants in intervention and control groups were comparable in sex [χ^2 (1, $N = 89$) = 0.11, $p >.05$], age [$F(1, 88) = 0.07$, $p >.05$], socioeconomic status [$F(1, 87) = 2.06$, $p >.05$], and ethnicity [χ^2 (1, $N = 89$) = 1.70, $p >.05$]. Due to school dropouts (independent of the project), and absences from school during the administration of the questionnaire, 20 responses were excluded from the study. The number of cases that were eligible for the longitudinal quantitative evaluation (i.e., that completed both assessments) were 69. The students who completed both assessments did not differ from the ones who completed one questionnaire in sex [χ^2 (1, $N = 89$) = 4.15, $p >.05$], age [$F(1, 88) = 0.08$, $p >.05$], socioeconomic status [$F(1, 87) = 1.10$, $p >.05$], and ethnicity [χ^2 (1, $N = 89$) = 4.15, $p >.05$]. Moreover, using analysis of variance for multiple dependent variables, there were no significant differences between those who dropped out and those who participated in social well-being [$F(1, 87) = 0.04$, $p >.05$], identification as European [$F(1, 87) = 3.62$, $p >.05$], attitudes toward the EU [$F(1, 87) = 1.81$, $p >.05$], political alienation [$F(1, 87) = 0.57$, $p >.05$], institutional trust [$F(1, 87) = 0.00$, $p >.05$], and participation at EU level [$F(1, 87) = 0.19$, $p >.05$].

The final sample included 69 adolescents (35 in the intervention group; 34 in the control group). The overall sample was 49% female and 51% male with an average age at pre-test of 15.74 years ($SD = 0.50$) and a range from 15 to 17. Thirteen percent of the sample belonged to a national/ethnic minority. In terms of demographic characteristics and socio-economic background, participants were similar to other contexts within Italy.

Statistical Analysis

The effect of this specific active citizenship intervention based on YPAR was assessed with a pretest-posttest control group design. To compare changes in the two groups over time, we fitted a generalized estimating equations procedure which extends the generalized linear model to allow for analysis of repeated measurements. The generalized estimating equations address at the time of analysis the fact that repeated measurements tend to be correlated with one another and deals with correlation structures that are expected from designs based upon repeated measures (Burton, Gurrin, & Sly, 1998). In addition, findings from simulation experiments in the context of pretest-posttest control group study design revealed that, with sample sizes of 50 and 100 participants, the GEE estimator the generalized estimating equations performed the best compared with other methods including ANCOVA (Yang & Tsiatis, 2001). As a measure of effect size, we used partial eta squared (partial η^2). Cohen (1988) had suggested values of f that correspond to values of partial η^2 of .01, .06, and .14 (rounded to two decimal places) to indicate small, medium, or large effects.

To test whether there were differences in the outcome measures at baseline between the control and the intervention group, we used analysis of variance for multiple dependent variables. Analysis of variance for multiple dependent variables was also used to explore whether the intervention had a stronger impact on participants with higher identification as European. Specifically, we performed a simple median split of the intervention group to distinguish between participants who scored high or low on identification as European at baseline.

Results

We found that there were no significant differences between participants in the control group and those in the intervention group in social well-being [$F(1, 87) = 0.14$, $p > .05$],

identification as European [$F(1, 87) = 0.06$, $p >.05$], attitudes toward the EU [$F(1, 87) = 0.01$, p $>.05$], political alienation [$F(1, 87) = 0.58$, $p >.05$], institutional trust [$F(1, 87) = 0.79$, $p >.05$], and participation at EU level [$F(1, 87) = 0.29$, $p >.05$].

Table 1 displays mean scores of outcome variables for each time and the effect size (partial η^2) calculated based on the difference between the group means on pre-test and post-test assessments. Our hypotheses were that participation in a citizenship intervention based on YPAR would be associated with higher levels of active citizenship and social well-being compared to a control group. These hypotheses were tested using generalized estimating equations. Results are shown in Table 2. The results showed significant interactions of Group $\times$ Time for political alienation, institutional trust, and participation at EU level and social well-being. These interactions could be interpreted as a significant increase in well-being, institutional trust, and participation at EU level and a significant decrease in political alienation for the intervention group as compared with the control group. The effect size for these significant effects was medium to large (Table 1). We found no significant effects for attitudes toward the EU and identification as European.

After performing a median split of the intervention group according to identification as European at baseline, we found that there were no significant differences between participants who reported higher or lower identification as European at baseline in post measures of social well-being [$F(1, 31) = 1.07$, $p >.05$], identification as European [$F(1, 31) = 0.06$, $p >.05$], attitudes toward the EU [$F(1, 31) = 0.45$, $p >.05$], political alienation [$F(1, 31) = 0.01$, $p >.05$], institutional trust [$F(1, 31) = 0.13$, $p >.05$], and participation at EU level [$F(1, 31) = 0.49$, p $>.05$].

Discussion

We presented the results of the impact evaluation of a two-years active citizenship intervention based on YPAR involving a group of high school students using a quasi-experimental design. The findings of the present study revealed that, compared to the control group, participants in the intervention group reported higher scores on social well-being, institutional trust, and participation and lower scores on political alienation. This study adds to the small, but growing, existing body of knowledge about YPAR which has demonstrated that participatory research with young people is an effective intervention approach for enhancing positive development and civic engagement (Anyon et al., 2018; Ozer, 2017). To our knowledge, this is the first study with a pretest-posttest control group design that provided evidence for the effectiveness of YPAR for promoting active citizenship.

Altogether, the findings of the present study supported our hypothesis that participation in YPAR increased active citizenship. As predicted, students who participated in the YPAR project reported higher scores on institutional trust, and participation and lower scores on political alienation following the intervention when compared with the control group; moreover, their social well-being increased. It is particularly important to emphasize that the magnitude of the effect sizes was medium to large. The improvement in active citizenship after the intervention was consistent with previous research documenting the effect of a YPAR in terms of developmental benefits (e.g., well-being, agency, social-emotional, interpersonal, and cognitive development, academic or career advancement) and civic engagement for the young people (Anyon et al., 2018; Jacquez et al., 2013; Ozer, 2017; Shamrova & Cummings, 2017). More in general, our findings point to the importance of enhancing students' involvement in the process of research on social issues relevant to them (ownership), requiring critical analysis of information sources (including direct access to reliable sources of information), to better

understand their nature and their root causes and reflect on measures that could be adopted to address them.

Two outcomes, attitudes toward the EU and identification as European, did not reach a significant difference. Our sense is that, through the intervention, participants experienced a significant change in the variables that had to do more with their concrete, practical experience of being citizens in Europe and less with its more abstract dimension. However, these outcomes question also the assumption that active citizenship requires a process of identification, while emphasizing the agentic side of citizenship instead of its cognitive one. Put it differently, engaging with the practice of citizenship, while contributing to the development of youth capacities to act in the political realm, may increase critical views of citizenship, questioning the relevance of supportive attitude and "acritical" identification as booster of active citizenship. These results are in line with the positions that contest the capacity of normative visions of active citizenship to capture the full variety of forms of social and political engagement. The students involved in the intervention in their future may not be supportive of EU policies, thus feeling less identified with the EU, but this does not mean that they will be less engaged or committed to change those policies. Moreover, participants did not develop more positive attitudes toward the EU as a current political entity. This finding may be the result of the practice of critical reflection on the current EU policies and political agenda, including supportive and critical views on national and EU political institutions. Indeed, in the current YPAR intervention, key features were the development of critical consciousness (Scott, Pyne, & Means, 2015) and sociopolitical awareness (Watts & Flanagan, 2007). Therefore, according to the theory of Ozer and Douglas (2015), participants may have been able to develop a more complex, articulated and critical view of EU political institutions.

A limitation of this study is that it focused on the intervention outcomes which were measured at individual level only (individual outcomes in the students involved). However, we must recognize that YPAR, through the engagement of young people, can become potentially a powerful means to catalyze local community organizing and revitalization (London, 2007). In this regard, several authors (e.g., Driskell, 2001; Hart, 1997) have highlighted young people's unique local knowledge about their neighborhoods and communities. The intense work that was done by the participants (in collaboration with the local community in particular in the first year of the project), putting some core community issues on the stage, suggests that this type of approach has the potential to impact on policymakers and on the community life in general.

A second limitation has to do with the small sample of participants involved in the intervention. Given the small sample size, the results cannot be representative of the student population in Italian high schools. In the literature, it has been pointed out that, due to curricular and organizational constraints, YPAR interventions conducted in the school settings may encounter greater challenges than interventions in community settings (Ozer et al., 2010). The need to engage students in group work to ensure adequate management of group dynamics and a high quality of the process of collaboration between the students and the adults, suggests the usefulness to focus on small samples. The results of this active citizenship intervention using YPAR, conducted in Italy, demonstrated that the effectiveness of YPAR interventions can be assessed using a pretest-posttest control group design, and add support to the positive impact of this approach in enhancing youth positive developmental outcomes. Therefore, they add to the still small body of empirical findings that support the effectiveness of YPAR across countries. Future implementations of this active citizenship intervention with a larger sample of students and in different countries would be fruitful in testing if the findings obtained in this study can be

generalized across national and cultural contexts. We also believe that the core features of the

intervention (e.g., phases and related activities that engaged the students) may be adapted to other

aims and content domains. In particular, the fact that the issues were chosen by students starting

from their experiences (and were not pre-ordered) allows the process to potentially focus on very

different issues or to focus on the same issues from different angles.

A third limitation of this evaluation is that randomization procedures were not feasible.

Since allocation to intervention conditions was nonrandom, there was a potential for selection

bias with the design of the current study. However, although systematic differences may exist

between the intervention and control groups at baseline, preliminary analyses did not reveal any

preexisting differences in terms of background variables as well as outcomes of the study.

Moreover, quasi-experimental research designs are common in applied research settings and very

suitable for investigating applied topics and real-life issues (Cook, Campbell, & Peracchio, 1990;

Grant & Wall, 2008). In addition, the selection of the school context was intentional.

Nevertheless, the school context was similar to other school contexts in Italy. In addition, we

must recognize that teachers were not randomly selected and assigned to the intervention or to

the control group, and this may represent a confounding factor. For example, we cannot exclude

that teachers who worked with the two groups could basically have different characteristics

(since we did not control for them). However, to our knowledge, there is no evidence that the

preexisting teachers' motivation and skills may have an influence when using the YPAR

approach. It was even found that the effect of teachers' experience with the YPAR curriculum

was small and not statistically significant (Ozer & Douglas, 2015). Indeed, teachers' preexisting

characteristics were not mentioned among the principles of YPAR and the factors influencing its

efficacy (e.g., Anyon et al., 2018; Cammarota & Fine, 2008; Ozer, 2017; Ozer & Douglas, 2015; Ozer et al., 2010; Rodriguez & Brown, 2009; Wright, 2015).

We also acknowledge that we employed measures that are constructs (i.e., conventions) and not objective attributes of participants. Moreover, the reliability estimates for the attitudes toward the European Union, participation, and trust were just below the accepted lower bound of .70 at (only) one time point. However, it should be noted that this particular level of alpha is a common presumption because "there is no sacred level of acceptable or unacceptable level of alpha. In some cases, measures with (by conventional standards) low levels of alpha may still be quite useful" (Schmitt, 1996, p. 353). Therefore, we believe that measures with Cronbach's alpha just below the conventional standard of .70 may be considered to be adequate.

Despite these limitations, this study demonstrated the effectiveness of YPAR in promoting active citizenship among youth. This approach reduced the feelings of political alienation and increased participants' social well-being, institutional trust, and participation at EU level. Therefore, the current YPAR intervention may be a useful approach for health educators and public health professionals to promote active citizenship and social well-being among high school students. In addition to more traditional civic education activities, practitioners may want to consider implementing a YPAR. To implement YPAR programs, practitioners can consult freely available YPAR program manuals or curriculum (for some examples, see Anyon et al., 2018). Practitioners should be aware that this YPAR program may not be useful for promoting greater identification with a political entity. This is because participants were invited to develop a critical consciousness of the political institutions and issues at stake and the measures (including political measures) adopted to address them. Our findings suggest that the iterative integration of research and action activities of the YPAR

enabled by a youth-adult partnership promoted social well-being, institutional trust, and

participation and decreased political alienation in youth participants. We believe that the results

of the present investigation are relevant for addressing active citizenship among young people in

a political divisive, nationalistic moment.

References

Antonini, M., Hogg, M. A., Mannetti, L., Barbieri, B., & Wagoner, J. A. (2015). *Motivating citizens to participate in public policymaking: Identification, trust and cost-benefit analyses* (Vol. 3).

Anyon, Y., Bender, K., Kennedy, H., & Dechants, J. (2018). A systematic review of youth participatory action research (YPAR) in the United States: Methodologies, youth outcomes, and future directions. *Health Education & Behavior, 45*(6), 865-878. doi:10.1177/1090198118769357

Barrett, M., & Zani, B. (Eds.). (2015). *Political and civic engagement. Multidisciplinary perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Bee, C. (2017). *Active Citizenship in Europe: Practices and Demands in the EU, Italy, Turkey and the UK*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berg, M., Coman, E., & Schensul, J. J. (2009). Youth action research for prevention: A multi-level intervention designed to increase efficacy and empowerment among urban youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 43*(3), 345-359. doi:10.1007/s10464-009-9231-2

Boeckmann, R. J., & Tyler, T. R. (2002). Trust, respect and the psychology of political engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(10), 2067-2088. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb02064.x

Burton, P., Gurrin, L., & Sly, P. (1998). Extending the simple linear regression model to account for correlated responses: An introduction to generalized estimating equations and multi-level mixed modelling. *Statistics in Medicine, 17*(11), 1261-1291.

Cammarota, J., & Fine, M. (2008). *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, D. E. (2008). *Why We Vote. How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Christens, B. D. (2012). Targeting empowerment in community development: A community psychology approach to enhancing local power and well-being. *Community Development Journal, 47*(4), 538-554. doi:10.1093/cdj/bss031

Cicognani, E., Albanesi, C., Mazzoni, D., Prati, G., & Zani, B. (2016). Explaining offline and online civic engagement intentions between Italian and migrant youth / Análisis de las intenciones de participación cívica virtual y presencial entre jóvenes italianos y emigrantes. *International Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(2), 282-316. doi:10.1080/02134748.2016.1143177

Cicognani, E., Pirini, C., Keyes, C., Joshanloo, M., Rostami, R., & Nosratabadi, M. (2008). Social participation, sense of community and social well being: A study on American, Italian and Iranian university students. *Social Indicators Research, 89*(1), 97-112. doi:10.1007/s11205-007-9222-3

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (second ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T., & Peracchio, L. (1990). Quasi experimentation. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 1, 2nd ed.* (pp. 491-576). Palo Alto, CA, US: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Crick, B., & Lockyer, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Active Citizenship What Could it Achieve and How?* Edinburgh Edinburgh University Press.

Dahl, V., Amnå, E., Banaji, S., Landberg, M., Šerek, J., Ribeiro, N., . . . Zani, B. (2018). Apathy

    or alienation? Political passivity among youths across eight European Union countries.

    European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15(3), 284-301.

    doi:10.1080/17405629.2017.1404985

Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2005). Psychological empowerment and subjective well-being.

    In D. Narayan (Ed.), *Measuring Empowerment. Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 25-

    140). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Driskell, D. (2001). *Creating better cities with children and youth: A manual for participation*.

    London: UNESCO and Earthscan Publications.

Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. A. (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*.

    Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Enchikova, E., Neves, T., Mejias, S., Kalmus, V., Cicognani, E., & Ferreira, P. D. (2019). Civic

    and political participation of European youth: Fair measurement in different cultural and

    social contexts. *Frontiers in Education, 4*(10). doi:10.3389/feduc.2019.00010

Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Fuchs, D., & Klingemann, H.-D. (Eds.). (2011). *Cultural diversity, European identity and the

    legitimacy of the EU*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Grant, A. M., & Wall, T. D. (2008). The neglected science and art of quasi-experimentation:

    Why-to, when-to, and how-to advice for organizational researchers. *Organizational

    Research Methods, 12*(4), 653-686. doi:10.1177/1094428108320737

Hart, R. (1997). *The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development

    and environmental care*. London: UNICEF/ Earthscan Publications.

Heggart, K. (2015). Social capital and civics and citizenship: Developing a framework for

    activist education. *Issues in Educational Research, 25*(3), 276-290.

Henn, M., & Foard, N. (2012). Young people, political participation and trust in Britain.

    Parliamentary Affairs, 65(1), 47-67. doi:10.1093/pa/gsr046

Henn, M., & Weinstein, M. (2006). Young people and political (in)activism: why don't young

    people vote? *Policy & Politics, 34*(3), 517-534. doi:10.1332/030557306777695316

Hoskins, B. L., & Mascherini, M. (2009). Measuring active citizenship through the development

    of a composite indicator. *Social Indicators Research, 90*(3), 459-488.

    doi:10.1007/s11205-008-9271-2

Indire. (2019). School-Work Alternation.   Retrieved from

    http://www.indire.it/en/progetto/school-work-alternation/

Jacquez, F., Vaughn, L. M., & Wagner, E. (2013). Youth as partners, participants or passive

    recipients: A review of children and adolescents in community-based participatory

    research (CBPR). *American Journal of Community Psychology, 51*(1), 176-189.

    doi:10.1007/s10464-012-9533-7

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(2), 121-140.

    doi:10.2307/2787065

Keyes, C. L. M. (2004). Social well-being in the United States: A descriptive epidemiology. In

    O. G. Brim, C. D. Ryff, & R. Kessler (Eds.), *How Healthy Are We? A National Study of*

    Well-Being at Midlife (pp. 350-372). Chicago: University Chicago Press.

Keyes, C. L. M., Wissing, M., Potgieter, J. P., Temane, M., Kruger, A., & van Rooy, S. (2008).

    Evaluation of the Mental Health Continuum-Short Form (MHC-SF) in Setswana-

speaking South Africans. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 15*(3), 181-192.

doi:10.1002/cpp.572

Landberg, M., Eckstein, K., Mikolajczyk, C., Mejias, S., Macek, P., Motti-Stefanidi, F., . . .

Noack, P. (2018). Being both – A European and a national citizen? Comparing young

people's identification with Europe and their home country across eight European

countries. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*(3), 270-283.

doi:10.1080/17405629.2017.1391087

London, J. K. (2007). Power and pitfalls of youth participation in community-based action

research. *Children, Youth and Environments, 17*(2), 406-432.

London, J. K., Zimmerman, K., & Erbstein, N. (2003). Youth-led research and evaluation: Tools

for youth, organizational, and community development. *New Directions for Evaluation

2003*(98), 33-45. doi:10.1002/ev.83

Marsh, D., O'Toole, T., & Jones, S. (2007). *Young People and Politics in the UK. Apathy or

Alienation?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Mazzoni, D., Albanesi, C., Ferreira, P. D., Opermann, S., Pavlopoulos, V., & Cicognani, E.

(2018). Cross-border mobility, European identity and participation among European

adolescents and young adults. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*(3),

324-339. doi:10.1080/17405629.2017.1378089

Medrano, J. D., & Gutiérrez, P. (2001). Nested identities: national and European identity in

Spain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24*(5), 753-778. doi:10.1080/01419870120063963

Molix, L., & Bettencourt, B. A. (2010). Predicting well-being among ethnic minorities:

Psychological empowerment and group identity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,

40*(3), 513-533. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00585.x

Motti-Stefanidi, F., & Cicognani, E. (2018). Bringing the European Union closer to its young

   citizens: Youth active citizenship in Europe and trust in EU institutions. *European

   Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*(3), 243-249.

   doi:10.1080/17405629.2017.1423052

Newell, W. H., & Davis, A. J. (1988). Education for citizenship: The role of progressive

   education and interdisciplinary studies. *Innovative Higher Education, 13*(1), 27-37.

   doi:10.1007/BF00898129

Ozer, E. J. (2017). Youth-led participatory action research: Overview and potential for enhancing

   adolescent development. *Child Development Perspectives, 11*(3), 173-177.

   doi:10.1111/cdep.12228

Ozer, E. J., & Douglas, L. (2013). The impact of participatory research on urban teens: An

   experimental evaluation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 51*(1), 66-75.

   doi:10.1007/s10464-012-9546-2

Ozer, E. J., & Douglas, L. (2015). Assessing the key processes of youth-led participatory

   research: Psychometric analysis and application of an observational rating scale. *Youth &

   Society, 47*(1), 29-50. doi:10.1177/0044118X12468011

Ozer, E. J., Ritterman, M. L., & Wanis, M. G. (2010). Participatory action research (PAR) in

   middle school: Opportunities, constraints, and key processes. *American Journal of

   Community Psychology, 46*(1-2), 152-166. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9335-8

Parksepp, A. (2017). *Describing Russian-speaking youngsters as Estonian citizens.* Tartu

   Ülikool.

Petrillo, G., Capone, V., Caso, D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2015). The Mental Health Continuum–

    Short Form (MHC–SF) as a measure of well-being in the Italian context. *Social*

    Indicators Research, 121(1), 291-312. doi:10.1007/s11205-014-0629-3

Pospieszna, P., & Galus, A. (2018). Promoting active youth: Evidence from Polish NGO's civic

    education programme in Eastern Europe. *Journal of International Relations and*

    Development, 0, 1-27. doi:10.1057/s41268-018-0134-4

Postelnicescu, C. (2016). Europe's new identity: The refugee crisis and the rise of nationalism.

    Europe's Journal of Psychology, 12(2), 203-209. doi:10.5964/ejop.v12i2.1191

Prati, G., Cicognani, E., & Mazzoni, D. (2019). Cross-border friendships and collective

    European identity: A longitudinal study. *European Union Politics, 20*(4), 649-669.

    doi:10.1177/1465116519857158

Rodriguez, L. F., & Brown, T. M. (2009). From voice to agency: Guiding principles for

    participatory action research with youth. *New Directions for Youth Development,*

    2009(123), 19-34, 11. doi:10.1002/yd.312

Ross, A. (2007). Multiple identities and education for active citizenship. *British Journal of*

    Educational Studies, 55(3), 286-303. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8527.2007.00380.x

Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment, 8*(4), 350-

    353. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.8.4.350

Scott, M. A., Pyne, K. B., & Means, D. R. (2015). Approaching praxis: YPAR as critical

    pedagogical process in a college access program. *The High School Journal, 98*(2), 138-

    157.

Šerek, J., & Jugert, P. (2018). Young European citizens: An individual by context perspective on

    adolescent European citizenship. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 15*(3),

    302-323. doi:10.1080/17405629.2017.1366308

Shamrova, D. P., & Cummings, C. E. (2017). Participatory action research (PAR) with children

    and youth: An integrative review of methodology and PAR outcomes for participants,

    organizations, and communities. *Children and Youth Services Review, 81*, 400-412.

    doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.08.022

Sherrod, L., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of research on civic*

    engagement in youth. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Sindic, D. (2011). Psychological citizenship and national identity. *Journal of Community &*

    Applied Social Psychology, 21(3), 202-214. doi:10.1002/casp.1093

Smith, L., Beck, K., Bernstein, E., & Dashtguard, P. (2014). Youth participatory action research

    and school counseling practice: A school-wide framework for student well-being.

    Journal of School Counseling, 12(21), 1-31.

Stevenson, C., Dixon, J., Hopkins, N., & Luyt, R. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship,

    participation and social exclusion: introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of*

    Social and Political Psychology, 3(2), 1-19. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.579

Stoeckel, F. (2016). Contact and community: The role of social interactions for a political

    identity. *Political Psychology, 37*(3), 431-442. doi:doi:10.1111/pops.12295

Theiss-Morse, E. (1993). Conceptualizations of good citizenship and political participation.

    Political Behavior, 15(4), 355-380. doi:10.1007/BF00992103

Tilly, C. (2007). *Democracy*. New York: Cambridge.

Wallerstein, N., Sanchez, V., & Velarde, L. (2004). Freirian praxis in health education and

community organizing: A case study of an adolescent prevention program. In M. Minkler

(Ed.), *Community organizing and community building for health* (pp. 218-236). New

Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Watts, R. J., & Flanagan, C. (2007). Pushing the envelope on youth civic engagement: A

developmental and liberation psychology perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology,*

35(6), 779-792. doi:10.1002/jcop.20178

Wright, D. E. (2015). *Active learning: Social justice education and participatory action*

research. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yang, L., & Tsiatis, A. A. (2001). Efficiency study of estimators for a treatment effect in a

pretest–posttest trial. *The American Statistician, 55*(4), 314-321.

doi:10.1198/000313001753272466

Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and

community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of*

community psychology. (pp. 43-63). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic

Publishers.

Zimmerman, M. A., Eisman, A. B., Reischl, T. M., Morrel-Samuels, S., Stoddard, S., Miller, A.

L., . . . Rupp, L. (2018). Youth Empowerment Solutions: Evaluation of an after-school

program to engage middle school students in community change. *Health Education &*

Behavior, 45(1), 20-31. doi:10.1177/1090198117710491

Zimmerman, M. A., Stewart, S. E., Morrel-Samuels, S., Franzen, S., & Reischl, T. M. (2010).

Youth empowerment solutions for peaceful communities: Combining theory and practice

in a community-level violence prevention curriculum. *Health Promotion Practice, 12*(3),

425-439. doi:10.1177/1524839909357316

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Effect Size (Partial η^2) on Outcome Variables for the Intervention Group and Control Group at Pre-Test and Post-Test Assessments (Participants $n = 69$)

| | Pre-test | | | | Post-test | | | | |
| | Control group | | Intervention group | | Control group | | Intervention group | | |
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Partial η^2
Social well-being	2.66	0.71	2.60	0.46	2.43	0.66	2.80	0.73	.08
Identification as European	3.18	0.58	3.00	1.03	3.15	0.80	3.20	0.62	.01
Attitudes toward the European Union	3.06	0.56	2.81	0.63	3.17	0.49	3.09	0.45	.02
Political alienation	3.15	0.81	3.10	0.85	3.31	0.85	2.85	0.54	.05
Institutional trust	3.31	0.66	3.07	0.91	3.29	0.65	3.58	0.65	.13
Participation at European Union level	0.59	1.13	0.47	0.81	0.36	0.75	0.82	1.24	.05

Table 2

Results from Generalized Estimating Equations Analyses of Outcome Variables (Participants *n* = 69)

	β	SE	95% CI	*p*
Social well-being				
Group	0.19	0.15	-0.12, 0.49	.229
Time	0.06	0.04	-0.02, 0.14	.119
Group × time	-0.14	0.06	-0.25, -0.03	.013
Identification as European				
Group	0.10	0.23	-0.36, 0.56	.679
Time	0.07	0.06	-0.04, 0.19	.208
Group × time	-0.04	0.07	-0.19, 0.10	.542
Attitudes toward the European Union				
Group	-0.04	0.17	-0.39, 0.30	.801
Time	0.06	0.04	-0.01, 0.14	.089
Group × time	0.02	0.05	-0.09, 0.12	.761
Political alienation				
Group	-0.05	0.21	-0.46, 0.36	.827
Time	-0.09	0.04	-0.17, 0.00	.042
Group × time	0.13	0.06	0.00, 0.25	.043
Institutional trust				
Group	0.24	0.25	-0.25, 0.74	.342

Time	0.10	0.05	0.19, 4.28	.038
Group × time	-0.15	0.06	-0.27, -0.03	.015
Participation at European Union level				
Group	0.44	0.30	-0.14, 1.03	.137
Time	0.24	0.14	-0.02, 0.51	.075
Group × time	-0.32	0.15	-0.62, -0.02	.038

Note. CI = confidence intervals.