



Gamson's Mistrustful-Efficacious Political Participation Hypothesis in adolescents using the ICCS 2022

Daniel Miranda, department of Psychology, Universidad de Chile

Felipe Sánchez-Barría, Universidad de los Andes

Núcleo Milenio Desigualdades y Oportunidades Digitales.

Centre for Conflict and Social Cohesion Studies.

X Seminar “Data from and for the educational system: tools for research and teaching”

Ostia, Rome, 19 - 20 - 21 November 2025



Introduction.

- Young people have played a prominent role in the global trend towards protest participation to the detriment of more traditional forms of political involvement.
- In recent years younger generations have not only been the drivers and protagonists of the protest but often exceeded their more peaceful and “normalized” forms to make their demands heard.



Research question(s)

- What drives some young people to adopt radical forms of protest, while others stick to conventional participation—or choose not to get involved at all?
- What factors are associated with the expected participation among a population still undergoing political socialization?
- Studies on the individual determinants of political participation typically focus on the resource model, political opportunities, or biographical availability.
- However, the variables used in these models help predict participation but are less useful to distinguish between forms of participation.

The Mistrustful-Efficacious Hypothesis

- In 1968, concerned by the growing social mobilization and the decline of trust in institutions among young people in the United States, sociologist William Gamson proposed the following hypothesis regarding participation in protests:

“An optimal condition of political mobilization was a combination of low political trust and high internal political efficacy. This can “stoke the fires” of political activism, including protesting, joining rallies, and participating in demonstrations” (Gamson 1968, 48.)

- In this vein, Norris (1999) calls “critical citizens” and Dalton (2004) “dissatisfied democrats” those who show low trust toward institutions and the established political system but at the same time trust that individual and collective action can bring about change.


Our (in progress) work.

- Gamson's hypothesis has been tested mostly in adult populations and in case studies with ambiguous results.
- Using the combination of institutional trust and political self-efficacy to generate typologies of “expected political participants”, we test this hypothesis, in an adolescent sample across 24 countries.

Data and Measurements

- We employ the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2022 - ICCS, around 80000 students in 8th grade (ages 14-15) from 24 countries participated .
- We developed the “Gamson typology,” which classifies students into five groups based on their levels of self-efficacy and political trust. To define these levels, we used the 25th and 75th percentiles as cutoff points, categorizing students as having either low or high self-efficacy and political trust accordingly.

Data and Measurements



Self-Efficacy and Institutional Trust

- **Scale Students' citizenship self-efficacy (S_CITEFF)** is an IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10, based on seven items regarding the degree of agreement with statements (e.g. IS4G29A: Argue your point of view about a controversial political or social issue or IS4G29F: Speak in front of your class about a social or political issue)
- **Students' trust in civic institutions (S_INTRUST)** is an IRT WLE scores with mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10, based on six items assessing the degree of trust that students have in institutions (e.g. IS4G27A: The national government of country of test, IS4G27B:The local government of your town or city, IS4G27C: Courts of justice, IS4G27D: The police, IS4G27E:Political parties, and IS4G27F:Parliament/congress.

Gamson typology

The “Gamson groups” are as follows:

- **“Dissidents.”** (or “Critical Citizens”): youth who scored above the 75th percentile (high) in internal efficacy but below the 25th percentile (low) in political trust
- **Assureds** (or Loyals): High internal efficacy and high political trust.
- **Alienated**: Low internal efficacy and low political trust.
- **Subordinates**: Low internal efficacy and high political trust.
- **Moderates** Those youth who reported intermediate levels of self-efficacy and institutional trust

Types of Participation

We use two dependent variables that measure the intention to engage in different forms of participation:


- **Expected participation in legal activities (S_LEGACT)**: composed of various items that ask whether the students has the intention to participate in different actions
- **Expected participation in illegal protest activities (S_ILLACT)**, composed of various items that ask whether the students has the intention to participate in different actions
- **Reported participation in digital activities (S_ENGDM)**, composed of various items tha ask about students' engagement with political or social issues using digital media

Hypothesis on political participation.

- **Dissidents.** (or “Critical Citizens”): greater expectation of “illegal” or disruptive participation, compared to other groups.
- **Assureds** (or Loyals): greater expectation of “legal” or conventional participation, compared to other groups.
- **Alienated**: Lower expectation of any kind of participation, compared to other groups.
- **Subordinates**: Lower expectation of any kind of participation, compared to other groups.
- **Moderates**: The reference category. Any significant difference observed in each category within the “Gamson typology” thus should be interpreted as a difference concerning the more typical group.


Legal Participation

Effects of each Gamson typology by country




Illegal Participation

Effects of each Gamson typology by country



Digital Participation

Effects of each Gamson typology by country



Conclusion

- The Distrustful-Effective Hypothesis is partially fulfilled. The most effective groups (Assured and Dissidents) do indeed show higher expectations of participation. However, there is no clear preference for one form of participation or another according to the participant categories.
- The hypothesis tend to works better with reported digital participation
- The “Assured” (high political trust and high self-efficacy) are the group with the highest expectations of participation, in the different countries studied.

Discussion

- We conducted a similar analysis using a Chilean sample, and those results aligned more closely with Gamson's hypothesis.
- One possible explanation is that in the Chilean study we examined actual participation, whereas the ICCS data capture expectations (excepto for digital).
- Youth with high self-efficacy, regardless of their institutional trust, may view multiple forms of engagement as normatively acceptable and even necessary.

Thank you!

- Daniel Miranda (danmiranda@uchile.cl)
- Felipe Sánchez-Barría (fasanchez@uc.cl)