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Abstract

We investigated whether the link between family-of-origin socioeconomic status (SES) and civic engagement in young adulthood is mediated by youth’s work values, i.e., the desired characteristics of their current or future jobs. We used data from a Finnish study: 2004 (age 16–18, \( N_{T1} = 1,301 \)); 2011 (age 23–25, \( N_{T2} = 1,096 \)); and 2014 (age 25–27, \( N_{T3} = 1,138 \)). A higher family SES in 2004 predicted youth’s higher civic engagement in 2014. A higher family SES also predicted a lower importance of extrinsic job rewards (e.g., good pay) in 2011, but it was unrelated to the importance of intrinsic job rewards (e.g., learning opportunities). Extrinsic work values, in turn, predicted lower civic engagement in 2014, above and beyond sociodemographic and personality characteristics. Intrinsic work values predicted higher civic engagement. Thus, extrinsic, but not intrinsic, work values partly mediated the link between family SES and youth civic engagement.
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For a democracy to function well, citizens should care about social and political issues, know how to express and defend their political interests in a constructive way, and be prepared to support disadvantaged groups. An important way of achieving this is civic engagement: individual and collective action designed to identify and address issues of public concern (APA, 2015). Civic knowledge, skills, and motivations that are requisite for such action are largely formed in youth and early adulthood (Flanagan & Levine, 2010). Through civic engagement, young people not only contribute to the common good, but also benefit themselves, e.g., by making social connections, acquiring knowledge and skills, and even finding work opportunities (Ruiter & De Graaf, 2009; Wilson & Musick, 2003).

Because of these benefits, persistent social inequalities in the rates of civic engagement raise concerns among researchers and policy-makers (Flanagan & Levine, 2010; Levinson, 2010; Verba et al., 1995). Research has consistently linked lower SES to lower rates of volunteering, charitable giving, and political engagement in youth, and several potential mediating mechanisms of this link have been explored (Brown & Lichter, 2007; Carlo, Padilla-Walker, & Day, 2011; Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Mustillo, Wilson, & Lynch, 2004; Verba et al., 1995). In the present study, we propose that another such mechanism may be found in the values individuals place on different aspects of paid work, a life domain that becomes central during the transition to adulthood.

We argue that youth’s work values (i.e., the importance that they place on different characteristics of their current or future jobs; Johnson & Mortimer, 2011; Taris & Feij, 2001) may influence their participation in other life domains, including civic life. In particular, we
draw on the selection–optimization–compensation model (SOC; Baltes, 1997), which posits that individuals possess limited resources that they have to invest selectively to achieve desired outcomes. Consequently, it pays off to pursue similar and mutually facilitating life goals. *Intergoal facilitation* occurs when progressing towards one goal simultaneously helps in pursuing another, whereas *intergoal conflict* occurs when the pursuit of one goal interferes with the pursuit of another (Emmons & King, 1988; Riediger & Freund, 2004). Research has found that when individuals perceive conflict between life goals, they exhibit lower goal engagement and lower subjective well-being (Emmons & King, 1988; Riediger & Freund, 2004; Wiese & Salmela-Aro, 2008). Depending on the adopted perspective, civic engagement can be viewed as promoting one’s work goals, or as irrelevant or even disadvantageous to these goals.

*Intrinsic work values* refer to the importance individuals place on job rewards that are inherent to the activity itself, such as learning opportunities, interesting and varied job tasks, and a good match with one’s abilities (Johnson & Mortimer, 2011; Taris & Feij, 2001). Youth who value intrinsic job rewards may perceive civic engagement as compatible with their work goals, because civic engagement is a meaningful, self-directed activity that provides ample opportunity to learn new skills, which can later be applied in one’s job (Wilson, 2012). In contrast, *extrinsic work values* refer to the importance placed on external rewards or outcomes of paid work, such as a good salary, possibilities of promotion, or job security. Youth who value extrinsic job rewards may perceive civic engagement as interfering with their work goals, because civic engagement, although potentially useful career-wise in the long run (Ruiter & De Graaf, 2009; Wilson & Musick, 2003), does not bring immediate material rewards, does not increase job security, and consumes time and energy that could otherwise be directly invested in paid work.
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As youth’s work values are influenced by their parents’ SES (Kohn & Schooler, 1969; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979), work values may be considered as a candidate mechanism that explains the link between family SES and civic engagement. We examined this idea using data from a 10-year longitudinal study of Finnish youth, investigating whether young adults’ work values mediate the effect of family SES assessed in adolescence on civic engagement in young adulthood. We tested the effects of work values against competing explanatory variables, including young adults’ own SES, personality traits, and autonomous motivation. Below, we review the literature on each of the paths implicated by our mediational model.

Family SES and Offspring’s Civic Engagement

The most prominent accounts of socioeconomic gaps in youth civic engagement stem from sociological research, which has identified status transmission and role modeling as possible mechanisms (Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Mustillo et al., 2004; Verba et al., 1995). Status transmission implies that children of higher-SES parents grow up to have a higher SES themselves. A higher SES, in turn, fosters civic engagement, presumably because better-off persons are more aware of civic and political issues, possess more “civic skills” (e.g., public speaking), are more socially integrated, and are more likely to be recruited by civic organizations (Verba et al., 1995; Wilson, 2012). Already at school, U.S. adolescents from better-off families and neighborhoods receive more civic learning opportunities, which further increase their propensity to get engaged (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008). Furthermore, role modeling means that higher-SES parents are themselves more likely to be civically engaged, setting an example for their children (Janoski & Wilson, 1995; Mustillo et al., 2004).

Psychological research, in turn, has sought to explain the family SES–youth civic engagement link through such mediators as parent–child connectedness (Carlo et al., 2011) and
adolescent self-esteem and cognitive ability (Brown & Lichter, 2007), all of which may be undermined by family socioeconomic disadvantage. Providing indirect evidence for another possible mediator, Wray-Lake, Flanagan, and Maggs (2012) reported that U.S. mothers’ lower education and ethnic minority status (i.e., Black) predicted giving more caution messages (i.e., the value of being wary of others) to their offspring. As generalized trust is of pivotal importance in the development of civic engagement (Flanagan, 2003), receiving exaggerated caution messages from parents might undermine youth civic engagement. In the present study, we look for another potential mediator between family SES and civic engagement in the domain of paid work, which emerges as a central developmental task during the transition to adulthood (Havighurst, 1972).

**Family SES and Work Values**

Classical studies on work values showed that youth with a lower family SES had higher extrinsic work values, whereas those from a higher-SES background tended to value intrinsic and autonomy work values more (Kohn & Schooler, 1969; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979). More recent research has also found a robust link between family SES and extrinsic work values in samples from Finland and Germany (Lechner, Sortheix, Göllner, & Salmela-Aro, 2016). This link has been explained by two mechanisms: socialization and compensation. **Socialization** implies that parents directly convey their work values—which are shaped by their own work experiences—to their children. As Kohn and Schooler (1969) remarked, “The conditions of occupational life at lower social class levels limit men’s view of the job primarily to extrinsic benefits it provides, foster[ing] a narrowly circumscribed conception of self and society” (p. 677). **Compensation** means that youth raised in relatively disadvantaged contexts prioritize material aspects of work (e.g., job security, salary) to compensate for experiences of material insecurity. In contrast, youth
from more privileged families may take extrinsic job rewards for granted and can afford focusing on higher-level needs, e.g., personal growth (e.g., Johnson & Mortimer, 2011). Thus, there are both conceptual and empirical arguments for the link between family SES and youth work values. Work values, in turn, may affect the selection of goals and behaviors in other life domains, including civic engagement, as we will argue next.

**Consequences of Work Values and a Link to Civic Engagement**

Work values have well-known consequences for work-related outcomes. Higher intrinsic work values predict better-quality jobs and actually obtained intrinsic job rewards (Johnson & Monserud, 2012; Johnson & Mortimer, 2011). Higher extrinsic work values, by contrast, are associated with a lower level of well-being at work, heightened work–family conflict, and working longer hours (which, however, also implies higher earnings, Johnson & Monserud, 2012; Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). Although this evidence suggests that valuing extrinsic job rewards may result in focusing on work at the expense of other life domains, possible cross-domain effects of work values have hardly been investigated. Most importantly, no study appears to have used work values to predict civic engagement, even though evidence exists that participating in volunteering activities and intrinsic work values are positively interrelated in U.S. adolescents (Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer, & Snyder, 1998).

It seems very likely that such cross-domain effects exist, especially in young adulthood. Research has shown that improving one’s labor market chances is a frequent reason for volunteering among young people in the US and Canada, even though such pragmatic motivations are often combined with altruistic ones (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Hustinx et al., 2010). From this perspective, it appears that civic engagement facilitates the labor market entry and may itself be promoted by career-related motives (Hustinx et al., 2010; Pavlova & Silbereisen, 2014;
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Wilson & Musick, 2003). At the same time, Oesterle, Kirkpatrick Johnson, and Mortimer’s (2004) finding that working full-time reduces the likelihood of civic engagement during the transition to adulthood provides indirect evidence for a trade-off between the two domains. Thus, prior research suggests that both intergoal conflict and facilitation between paid work and civic engagement are possible. In this article, we argue that the underlying motivation for work (i.e., work values) is more consequential for civic engagement than the employment status per se or the number of hours worked. Youth who seek more intrinsic job rewards may see civic engagement to be compatible with their work goals, whereas those who seek more extrinsic job rewards may perceive civic engagement as interfering with their work goals. As work values are partly shaped by family SES, they might explain some of the SES gap in youth civic engagement.

The Present Study

The goals of this study were to investigate: (a) whether young individuals’ work values predict their civic engagement and mediate its relationship with family SES and (b) whether these effects stand the test against rival explanatory variables. We expected a higher family SES in adolescence to predict higher civic engagement (Hypothesis 1), as well as a lower importance of extrinsic and a higher importance of intrinsic job rewards (Hypotheses 2a and 2b, respectively) in young adulthood. Furthermore, we anticipated a higher importance of extrinsic job rewards to predict lower civic engagement (Hypothesis 3a) and a higher importance of intrinsic job rewards to predict higher civic engagement (Hypothesis 3b). Finally, we hypothesized that extrinsic and intrinsic work values would mediate the effect of family SES on offspring’s civic engagement (Hypothesis 4).
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To test these propositions, we utilized data from the Finnish Educational Transitions (FinEdu) studies, which followed Finnish secondary school students through their transitions into further education and employment. We operationalized family SES via one of its key indicators, parental occupational status (Lien, Friestad, & Klepp, 2001). The outcome variable was youth’s engagement in a variety of unpaid activities directed at the common good (e.g., volunteering and monetary donations), including typical protest activities (e.g., participating in a demonstration and boycotting goods and products). Being aware of the heterogeneity of civic engagement, with possible distinctions along the dimensions of civic versus political, giving time versus giving money, and others (Pavlova & Silbereisen, 2015; Verba et al., 1995), we also probed whether our findings would differ across different forms of civic engagement.

To demonstrate the robustness and uniqueness of work values as a psychological mechanism linking family SES to civic engagement in young adulthood, we included a number of rival explanatory variables into our analyses. First, young individuals’ current SES and employment status are typically associated with the SES of their family of origin, their work values, and civic engagement (i.e., status transmission; Johnson & Mortimer, 2011; Verba et al., 1995; Wilson, 2012). Second, even though research has found only small associations between various work values and the Big Five personality dimensions (Leuty & Hansen, 2012), work values may partly reflect broad personality dispositions which, in turn, have reliable associations with civic engagement (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Mondak, Hibbing, Canache, Seligson, & Anderson, 2010). Third, the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic work values is partly similar to the concept of autonomous motivation (i.e., pursuing activities for their own sake or because they are important to the self) versus controlled motivation (i.e., feeling pressured to pursue an activity; Deci & Ryan, 2008). Because autonomous motivation is related to prosocial
behaviors, including civic engagement (Gagné, 2003), we also considered it as a rival explanatory variable.

**Method**

**Sample and Procedure**

The FinEdu study (http://wiredminds.fi/projects/finedu/) comprises two master samples that were asked to participate in the first survey in 2004 and in follow-ups in 2005, 2006, 2008/09, 2011, and 2013/14. The first master sample included all ninth-grade students from all comprehensive schools (median age in 2004: 16 years) in a middle-sized Finnish city (population: 105,000). The second master sample comprised all second-year students from all upper secondary schools (median age in 2004: 18 years) from the same city. In 2004, this city’s population (ca. 97,000) had very similar sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., average age, gender distribution, demographic dependency ratio, unemployment rate, religious affiliations, and common types of schools) to the overall Finnish population. However, this city had a slightly higher proportion of better educated individuals, but a lower average disposable income, than the general population (Statistics Finland, 2016).

While respondents were still in school (until 2006 and 2005 for the first and second sample, respectively), data collection took place in classrooms. After leaving school, respondents received postal or online questionnaires, and a small subset participated in telephone interviews. Efforts were made to motivate respondents to participate through raffles or vouchers, and repeated reminders. In line with Finnish laws and with institutional approval, researchers obtained passive parental consent and active student consent for study participation.

For the present study, we utilized data collected in 2004, 2011, and 2013/2014 from both samples. At each wave, researchers tried to reach all of the individuals from the original master
samples, including those who were not present at the first wave; for this reason, some respondents who did not participate in earlier waves (re-)entered the panel later. The total number of respondents who participated in at least one of these three waves was 1,533. Of those, 764 respondents were present at all three measurements. Attrition analyses showed that female gender and higher educational attainment significantly reduced the likelihood of dropout, effects that are typical of longitudinal studies; the likelihood of dropout did not depend on parental occupational status. We included all respondents who participated in at least one of these three waves in our analyses. Focusing only on those who participated in at least two waves, as well as different ways of handling missing data, did not affect our substantive conclusions (see Data Analysis for details). Online Table A1 provides information on sample sizes and response rates for all waves.

Measures

Civic engagement. In 2013/2014, respondents reported how often they had engaged in different civic and organizational activities across the past two years (1 = never; 5 = very often). We selected seven activities that represented more or less active involvement (rather than a mere interest) and were explicitly civic (i.e., directed at the common good/policy change): donating money to an organization or charity; boycotting a product; buying a product for ethical reasons; signing a petition; participating in a demonstration; partaking in a political event; doing voluntary work. We used a single latent engagement factor across all seven items (α = .75) in our main analysis model; as a robustness check, we also tested an index (i.e., sum score), which yielded nearly indistinguishable findings. Furthermore, in supplementary analyses, we tested whether our results were robust across different subtypes of civic behaviors into which the seven items could be clustered (consumer engagement, political engagement, and volunteering).
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**Work values.** We used eight items derived from the Meaning of Work Study (MOW International Research Team, 1987), administered in 2011, to measure work values. Respondents indicated, on a 7-point-scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree), to what extent different job characteristics influenced their career choice (“My career choice is particularly influenced by the fact that the job offers…”). Extrinsic work values (α = .67) comprised “good pay”; “good opportunity for upgrading and promotions”; “convenient work hours and good physical working conditions”; and “work that has a promising view of future employment”. Intrinsic work values (α = .75) comprised “interesting work”; “a lot of opportunity to learn new things and develop vocationally”; “a good match between job requirements and my abilities and strengths”; and “a lot of variety”. Previous research attests to the criterion validity of these and similar items in predicting subjective and objective career-related outcomes (e.g., Johnson & Mortimer, 2011; Sortheix, Chow, & Salmela-Aro, 2015; Taris & Feij, 2001). We modeled the two work value dimensions as latent EFA factors (see Data Analysis).

**Family SES.** Family SES was based on respondents’ open-ended reports of their parents’ occupations in 2004. Occupational status is one of three key SES indicators (the other being education and income). In FinEdu, it was chosen on the grounds that, being closer to people’s actual work experiences and ascribed societal status, occupational status captures socioeconomic inequality in an egalitarian society such as Finland better than do education or income. Prior research also supports the validity of adolescent reports of parental occupational status (Lien et al., 2001); adolescents are fairly accurate at reporting their parents’ occupations, in contrast to parental income and education, of which youth are often poorly informed. Participants’ reports of their parents’ occupations were coded according to a standard classification system (Official Statistics of Finland, 1989). We assessed the interrater reliability for this measure of family SES.
A second independent rater coded 400 cases (200 for mother and 200 for father SES). Person’s \( r \) between raters’ codes was .99 for mothers’ occupation and .89 for fathers’ occupation. We then recoded the original codes into the following categories that reflect a status hierarchy: 1 = blue-collar (e.g., electrician, baker, hairdresser); 2 = lower white-collar (e.g., nurse, real estate agent, salesperson); and 3 = upper white-collar (e.g., engineer, doctor, journalist). We coded parents who were self-employed (\( n = 114 \)) in one of the three categories if the available information on their business/industry permitted it; otherwise, we assigned them a missing value. We also assigned a missing value to parents who were not employed (e.g., students, pensioners, the disabled; \( n = 261 \)). Overall, we were able to classify at least one parent into one of the three occupational status categories for 1,200 out of the 1,301 adolescents (92%) who participated in the first wave, and for 908 (70%) we could classify both parents.

Among fathers, 35.0% were blue-collar workers, 27.9% were lower white-collar workers, and 37.1% were upper white-collar workers; among mothers, the numbers were 12.6%, 61.5% and 25.9%, respectively. We used information on both parents’ occupational status (Spearman’s \( Rho = .35 \)) to estimate a latent variable, as outlined in the Data Analysis section (analyses using the mean score or the highest value of two parents yielded almost identical results).

**Personality traits.** Traits were measured by a brief 15-item version of the Big Five Inventory administered in 2008 (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). Items were answered on a five-point rating scale. We computed two second-order personality factors often used in previous research (Digman, 1997; using five separate dimensions yielded the same substantive conclusions, but this model was less parsimonious). The “alpha” factor includes nine items form the agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability domains—socially desirable traits that are required to enact adult social roles (Digman, 1997; Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007). The
“beta” factor comprises six items form the extraversion and openness to experience domains—traits that reflect an agentic, curious, and open personality (Digman, 1997).

**Autonomous motivation.** Respondents reported an open-ended personal goal related to education, career, or work in 2011. They were then asked to describe their motivation for pursuing this goal (Sheldon & Kasser, 1995): extrinsic (“I’m pursuing this goal because somebody else wants me to or because the situation demands it”), introjected (“Because I’d feel ashamed, guilty or anxious if I did not”), identified (“Because I really believe it is an important goal”), and intrinsic (“Because of the enjoyment it gives me”), all rated on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all for this reason; 7 = completely for this reason). From these four items, we created an autonomous motivation index using the formula: \((2 \times \text{intrinsic} + \text{identified}) - (\text{introjected} + 2 \times \text{external})\); to obtain only non-negative integers, we then added a constant (+16). Higher values on this index reflect more autonomous motivation for pursuing one’s educational or career goal (for similar approaches, see Vasalampi et al., 2014).

**Individuals’ own SES.** We captured respondents’ own SES and employment status in 2011 with three variables: a five-point indicator of educational track/attainment (1 = no upper secondary degree; 2 = completed one upper secondary degree; 3 = studying for or completed another upper secondary degree, such as a vocational school certificate; 4 = studying for or completed a polytechnic institute degree; 5 = studying for or completed a university degree); a five-point item on financial difficulties (“How well does your income cover your expenses at present?”; 1 = extremely well; 5 = poorly); and a binary indicator of employment status (0 = still in education or only part-time employed; 1 = employed full time).

**Sociodemographic controls.** We included binary indicators of the study sample (0 = comprehensive school sample; 1 = upper secondary school sample) and gender (0 = male;
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1 = female. In terms of family background variables, we controlled for whether respondents were living with both biological parents in adolescence (0 = no; 1 = yes), their current relationship status (0 = single; 1 = romantic relationship, including marriage), and parenthood (0 = no children; 1 = at least one child). We took information on gender, study sample, and living arrangement from the 2004 wave and information on all other control variables from 2011.

Data Analysis

We used structural equation modeling (SEM) in Mplus 7.4 to test our hypotheses. First, we set up a measurement model with parental occupational status, extrinsic and intrinsic job rewards, and civic engagement as latent variables. The recently introduced exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) capacities enabled us to combine confirmatory (CFA) and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in the same model (Marsh, Morin, Parker, & Kaur, 2014). In particular, we modeled work values as oblique EFA factors, relaxing the unrealistic assumption that secondary loadings of items are all zero, which often leads to model misfit and inflated factor correlations (Marsh et al., 2014). We modeled the three-point manifest indicators of parental occupational status as well as the items assessing work values and civic engagement as ordered categorical variables, invoking the robust weighted least squares (WLS) estimator (i.e., WLSMV in Mplus). WLS does not assume normality and is the method of choice for modeling ordered categorical data, especially when sample size exceeds 200. Following common guidelines (e.g., Marsh, Hau, Grayson, 2005), we considered model fit to be acceptable when at least two out of the four commonly used fit indices were in the range conventionally considered to be acceptable (i.e., $\chi^2$ non-significant or at least within a four-to-one ratio to the $df$; CFI and TLI > .90 (“adequate”) or > .95 (“good”), RMSEA < .08, WRMR < 1, whereby less weight should be given to the $\chi^2$ because of its sensitivity to sample size and to the WRMR because its
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behavior is not as well studied and consistent as that of the CFI, TLI, and RMSEA). According to these criteria, the measurement model showed reasonable fit to the data, $\chi^2(106) = 309.898$, $p < .001$, $CFI = .97$, $TLI = .96$, $RMSEA = .036$, CI$_{90\%} = [.031, .041]$, $WRMR = 1.093$. As suggested by modification indices, this model included one residual correlation between two civic engagement items ("buying a product" and "boycotting a product"); constraining this correlation to equal zero did not alter any of the substantive conclusions from subsequent analyses. All standardized loadings on primary factors in the measurement model were .50 or greater. Online Table A1 shows all factor loadings.

Our structural model (see Figure 1) was one in which parental occupational status, sociodemographic controls, and respondents’ own SES in 2011 predicted work values, whereas parental occupational status, work values, rival explanatory variables (respondents’ own SES in 2011, personality, and autonomous motivation), and other controls predicted civic engagement. Despite its complexity, the structural model showed reasonable fit to the data, $\chi^2(249) = 652.63$, $p < .001$, $CFI = .95$, $TLI = .92$, $RMSEA = .033$, CI$_{90\%} = [.029, .036]$, $WRMR = 1.054$.

In order to test the mediational chain from parental occupational status to civic engagement through work values, we used a bootstrap with 1,000 random draws to obtain bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals for indirect effects. The WLSMV estimator in Mplus uses all available information (pairwise present) and has been shown to yield consistent estimates if data are missing at random or missing conditional on covariates included in the model (for details, see Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010). Thus, our analyses always used all available information from the entire sample, including cases with missing values caused by item non-response or unit non-response (longitudinal attrition). As a robustness check, we also re-estimated our results using the MLR estimator and full information maximum likelihood
estimation (FIML), as well as using multiple imputation of missing values on the key variables (family SES, work values, and civic engagement) with 10 imputed datasets. These different ways of treating missing data all yielded the same substantive conclusions, and indeed almost indistinguishable point estimates, attesting to the robustness of our main findings. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on all study variables and missing data information.

Results

Parental Occupational Status Predicting Work Values and Civic Engagement

Table 2 provides mediation results, and Figure 1 shows the SEM paths relevant to our hypotheses. Detailed regression results are available in online Tables A3 and A4. As predicted by Hypothesis 1, a higher parental occupational status in 2004 predicted higher civic engagement in 2013/2014 (“total effects” in Table 2)—above and beyond all sociodemographic control variables (cohort, gender, education, employment, financial difficulties, parenthood, relationship status, and family structure in childhood) as well as young adults’ own SES, alpha and beta personality factors, and autonomous motivation.

Furthermore, in support of Hypothesis 2a, a higher parental occupational status in 2004 predicted a lower importance of extrinsic job rewards among young adults in 2011 above and beyond the effects of all other sociodemographic factors. The effect size was small: parental occupational status alone explained slightly above 2% of the variance in extrinsic work values in a model without covariates (not shown). Contrary to Hypothesis 2b, parental occupational status did not significantly predict valuing intrinsic job rewards (only 0.1% of variance explained).

In line with Hypothesis 3a, valuing extrinsic job rewards predicted lower civic engagement above and beyond the effects of parental occupational status and rival explanatory variables (see Figure 1). In turn, and in line with Hypothesis 3b, valuing intrinsic job rewards
predicted higher civic engagement. The effects of parental occupational status and work values on civic engagement were substantial in size. In a model without covariates (not shown), parental occupational status and work values together explained 27% of the variance in the latent civic engagement factor.

**Mediating Effects of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Work Values**

Concordant with Hypothesis 4, lower extrinsic work values mediated the effect of higher parental occupational status on higher civic engagement, as indicated by a significant indirect effect shown in Table 2. (As both the path from parental occupational status to extrinsic work values and the path from these values to civic engagement were negative, the indirect effect had a positive sign.) The direct effect of parental occupational status on civic engagement remained positive, statistically significant, and sizable (see Figure 1 and Table 2), even in the presence of the indirect effect via extrinsic rewards, indicating that this mediation was only partial. By contrast, owing to its lack of association with parental occupational status, valuing intrinsic job rewards did not mediate the effect of parental occupational status on civic engagement. In sum, the results supported Hypothesis 4 for extrinsic, but not for intrinsic, work values as a mediator.

Among the rival explanatory variables, only personality was a significant predictor of civic engagement. In particular, the beta factor comprising extraversion and openness to experience was related to higher engagement, whereas the alpha factor consisting of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability was related to lower engagement, although less strongly so. Neither autonomous motivation in pursuing educational or occupational goals nor youth’s own SES and employment status had significant effects on later civic engagement when work values were in the model, pointing to the greater explanatory power of work values compared to these rival predictors.
Supplementary Analyses: Types of Engagement

Because our civic engagement factor comprised diverse activities, we tested whether our main findings held across different types of civic engagement. We distinguished between consumer engagement (buying a product, boycotting a product, and making monetary donations), political activism (signing a petition, participating in a demonstration, and participating in another political event), and volunteering (a single item on doing voluntary work). Supplementary analyses showed no substantial differences in our results across these three types of civic engagement (results available on request). For all types, the general pattern was that extrinsic, but not intrinsic, work values mediated the link between family SES and civic behaviors.

Discussion

This study investigated whether work values mediate the link between family SES and civic engagement in the transition to adulthood. Using data from a 10-year longitudinal Finnish study, we found support for many, but not all, paths in the proposed mediational model (see Figure 1). First, youth from lower-SES families endorsed extrinsic work values more strongly than did their higher-SES counterparts. This effect was observed when the participants were 23–25 years old, seven years after parental occupational status had been measured. This finding is consistent with previous research suggesting that low-SES parents pass on extrinsic work values to their children through early socialization (Kohn & Schooler, 1969) and that materialistic concerns increase under conditions of economic deprivation (Kasser, Ryan, Couchman, & Sheldon, 2004). Against our expectations, family SES was unrelated to intrinsic work values. In contrast to classical studies using earlier-born cohorts (Kohn & Schooler; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979), more recent studies have not always found the SES–intrinsic link (Johnson & Mortimer,
At least in Western societies, education is extended to the whole society, and aspiring for an interesting and fulfilling job appears to have become near-universal for young people, irrespective of their family socioeconomic backgrounds. Social desirability might have also influenced our participants’ reports, because students may prefer to report that they chose a job or career because it offered learning opportunities and is interesting, rather than because it provided a good salary and convenient work hours.

Second, young adults who placed more value on extrinsic job rewards reported lower, whereas those who endorsed more intrinsic job rewards reported higher civic engagement two years later, when they were 25–27 years old. We take these findings as indirect evidence for the differential compatibility of civic engagement with different types of work motivation.

According to the SOC model (Baltes, 1997; Riediger & Freund, 2004; Wiese & Salmela-Aro, 2008), multiple goals are easier to pursue if they facilitate each other than if they stand in conflict. As civic engagement, despite all its benefits, is only a secondary life domain, we argue that the likelihood of civic engagement will strongly depend on its compatibility with one’s life goals in primary life domains, such as family, education, and, as in this study, paid work. In particular, youth who seek opportunities for learning, skill use, and personal growth in their jobs (i.e., who hold intrinsic work values) will tend to regard civic engagement as an activity that resonates with their work goals. Indeed, civic engagement is thought to provide plentiful opportunities for acquiring soft skills (e.g., public speaking, negotiating, and event organizing), meeting new people, and exploring occupational roles (Ruiter & De Graaf, 2009; Verba et al., 1995; Wilson & Musick, 2003). In contrast, youth who place more value on salary, promotion, and job security (i.e., hold extrinsic work values) will be less likely to see any immediate
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connection between civic engagement and their work goals. As prior research in the work
domain found, extrinsic work values can be beneficial for some career outcomes, e.g., earnings
(Johnson & Mortimer, 2011), but can also lead to a conflict between paid work and other life
roles (i.e., family; Vansteenkiste et al., 2007). Our results contribute to this evidence, extend it to
the civic domain, and thus point to a “dark side” of extrinsic work values.

Our results may seem at odds with the well-known findings on career-related motives of
volunteering (Clary & Snyder, 1999; Hustinx et al., 2010). Namely, young labor market entrants
sometimes volunteer not only out of altruistic reasons but also to improve their career chances.
Civic engagement was indeed shown to have socioeconomic payoffs, in terms of an easier labor
market entry and a higher occupational status and higher earnings later on (Ruiter & De Graaf,
2009; Wilson & Musick, 2003). However, one has to consider that civic engagement, and
volunteering in particular, is not everywhere recognized as labor market relevant (Hustinx et al.,
2010). The signaling function of volunteer experience (i.e., to employers, it may signal desirable
personal qualities, such as agreeableness and initiative; Katz & Rosenberg, 2005) is only salient
where such experience is routinely put on the CV, which is not the case in Finland (Hustinx et
al., 2010). In other contexts (e.g., US and Canada), it is conceivable that even youth who hold
extrinsic work values may opt to get civically engaged, because they know civic engagement to
be instrumental in getting a place at a college or a higher-status job (Wilson, 2012). We would
still argue, though, that youth who are intrinsically motivated in the domain of paid work would
show higher and more sustained civic engagement because of a greater affinity between intrinsic
work values and civic engagement as a self-directed and challenging activity.

Our main finding was that extrinsic work values partly mediated the link between lower
parental occupational status in adolescence and lower civic engagement in young adulthood. The
other way round, youth from higher-SES backgrounds held lower extrinsic work values, and as we argue, partly for this reason, they were likelier to get civically engaged. Intrinsic work values were not significant mediators in our study because, as explained above, they were not predicted by family SES. Thus, the long arm of family SES on youth civic engagement can be partly explained by the types of rewards (and, as we argued, their compatibility with civic engagement) that youth seek to attain through paid work, a central life domain during the transition to adulthood. Although the indirect effect through extrinsic work values was small, it should be noted that the total effect of family SES on civic engagement was itself quite small and that ten years elapsed between the assessment of the predictor and the outcome. Effect sizes also compared favorably to the very small effects of other psychological mediators reported from prior research (Brown & Lichter, 2007; Carlo et al., 2011).

As our analyses including rival explanatory variables showed, the effects of work values could not be explained away by sociodemographic variables, by young adults’ own SES (educational attainment, employment status, and financial situation), by their personality traits, or by their autonomous versus controlled motivation in pursuing educational or career goals. Thus, our study provides strong evidence for unique, specific effects of extrinsic and intrinsic work values on civic engagement in young adulthood. Among the covariates, personality characteristics (in particular, the beta factor comprising openness to experience and extraversion) emerged as a significant predictor of later civic engagement, in line with prior research (Mondak et al., 2010). However, respondents’ educational attainment, employment status, and financial difficulties had hardly any bearing on civic engagement reported two years later. One explanation for this lack of effects could be that young adults’ status attainment was still in flux. When their own SES was assessed, our respondents were aged 23–25 years; as is typical in
Finland, many were still in post-secondary or tertiary education, and only one-third of them worked full-time. The finding that indicators of young adults’ own SES did not predict their civic engagement is also relevant given the possible argument that lower-SES individuals typically work in more precarious jobs (Johnson & Mortimer, 2011) and may not have sufficient time or money to participate in other life roles.

Practical Implications in the Finnish Context and Beyond

It may appear to be a rational decision for low-SES youth to focus on paid employment in order to gain material security and to avoid secondary pursuits such as civic engagement. With unemployment rates among young Finns (25–34 years) reaching up to 28.6% (Statistics Finland, 2016), the transition from school to work has become particularly challenging. This precarious situation may make paid work and its extrinsic rewards highly salient to Finnish youth, especially if they come from low-SES families. However, even if civic engagement is not commonly regarded as labor market relevant in Finland (Hustinx et al., 2010), research evidence shows that it brings socioeconomic payoffs not only in North American countries. For instance, Ruiter and De Graaf (2009) reported substantial positive effects of voluntary memberships and volunteering on later occupational status and earnings in the Netherlands, which is closer to Finland than to the US regarding its political and welfare system. It stands to reason that youth who value extrinsic job rewards could nevertheless be drawn into civic engagement if they were made aware of its indirect material benefits. Although civic engagement of such individuals would initially be driven by selfish motives, youth may discover other benefits and develop other motivations (e.g., altruism or self-development) in the course of their participation (Hustinx et al., 2010; Johnson et al., 1998). Therefore, to reduce SES disparities in youth civic participation in Finland and elsewhere, policy-makers might consider disseminating information on the
tangible benefits of civic engagement (i.e., occupational status and earnings), in addition to presenting its intangible career-related benefits, e.g., learning and exploration of career opportunities. These two kinds of messages would speak to different types of values that youth attach to paid work. Educational institutions could also work to strengthen their links to nonprofit associations and to shape youth perceptions of civic engagement as a valuable activity that could assist them in the transition to work.

Limitations and Future Directions

Some limitations of our study should be noted. As with all correlational research, we cannot establish causality. Even though our 10-year longitudinal design helped to ascertain the direction of effects, the only viable means of establishing a causal link between work values and civic engagement would be to conduct a randomized control trial that manipulates young people’s work values and traces their effects on civic engagement. Additionally, the sample suffered from longitudinal attrition, even though our supplementary analyses attested to the robustness of our findings across different ways of treating missing data.

Furthermore, our study was based on self-report data alone, which may lead to common method bias. Although it would be difficult to obtain accurate information on work values through a method other than self-report, future studies could benefit from using parent-reported SES measures and from obtaining information on respondents’ civic engagement from other sources, e.g., peers or voluntary organizations. It is also worth noting that we measured family SES in 2004 when respondents were adolescents; even though there is typically a strong continuity in SES within the same family, this measure may not necessarily represent family SES during the formative childhood years. Hence, this measure did not permit us to determine whether family SES has its most decisive effect on offspring’s later work values and engagement.
already during childhood or later. Other limitations of this measure were that it assessed only parental occupational status, whereas parental education and income were not included. As already noted, adolescents are often not well informed as regards these latter dimensions of their parents’ SES (Lien et al., 2001). Assuming that adolescents lack precise knowledge of their parents’ jobs, we did not attempt to derive a more differentiated occupational classification from adolescent reports either. Nevertheless, we believe that our SES measure was reasonably valid (Lien et al., 2001) and, at worst, might have yielded more conservative estimates of the SES effects on youth civic engagement.

Our analyses also included respondents from one nation only, and we cannot be certain whether our results generalize to other national contexts. On the one hand, the Finnish context of low socioeconomic inequality could have diminished the impact of family SES on youth civic engagement, leading us to expect even stronger effects in other contexts. On the other hand, the years between 2011 and 2014 were a period of an economic downturn in Finland. It is possible that extrinsic work values were more salient and had stronger effects on psychosocial outcomes for this cohort of Finns than for cohorts who entered the labor market in times of economic prosperity. In fact, there is recent evidence showing that the period of economic recession has increased the importance of security and wealth across Europe (Sortheix, Parker, Lechner, & Schwartz, 2016). Future research should, therefore, address similar research questions in other national contexts and other historical periods.

Finally, future studies could identify more direct ways of testing our idea that, depending on their work values, young individuals view civic engagement as more or less compatible with their work goals. For instance, perceived benefits of civic engagement, including work-related benefits, could be assessed and linked to the importance of intrinsic, extrinsic, and other types of
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work values. Another useful approach would be applying instruments developed in the goal research and within the SOC framework (e.g., Emmons & King, 1988; Riediger & Freund, 2004) to measure perceived conflict and facilitation between work goals and civic goals, especially among already civically engaged individuals, and predicting engagement intensity and duration from such indicators of intergoal relations.

Conclusions

Our 10-year longitudinal study offers first evidence that extrinsic work values (i.e., the importance attached to job security and material rewards) predict lower civic engagement in young adulthood and partly mediate the link between lower family SES and lower civic engagement in young adulthood. In contrast, intrinsic work values fostered civic engagement, demonstrating their relevance for outcomes beyond the work context; however, they were unrelated to family SES. We put forth adaptive motivational selectivity (SOC; Baltes, 1997; Riediger & Freund, 2004; Wiese & Salmela-Aro, 2008) as the mechanism underlying the diverging effects of extrinsic and intrinsic work values on civic engagement. Our findings contribute to a better understanding of the psychological pathways explaining the “long arm” of family socioeconomic conditions in shaping later civic engagement.
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Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Missing Data Information for All Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M (SD) or %</th>
<th>missing item(^a), %</th>
<th>missing total(^b), %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental occupational status 2004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>2.1 (0.6)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>2.0 (0.8)</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work values 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good pay</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>4.8 (1.4)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good opportunity for upgrading and promotion</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>4.6 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours and physical working conditions</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>5.4 (1.5)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising view of future employment</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>5.4 (1.4)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>6.5 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning opportunities</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>6.0 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match between job requirements and abilities</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>6.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>1 – 7</td>
<td>5.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic engagement 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boycotting a product for political reasons</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2.3 (1.3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying a product for political reasons</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2.7 (1.3)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donating money to an organization or charity</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2.3 (1.2)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing a petition</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>2.3 (1.1)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a political event</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1.4 (0.8)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in a demonstration</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1.2 (0.5)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing voluntary work</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>1.7 (1.1)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary school sample</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational track/attainment 2011</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>3.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment 2011</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties 2011</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>2.8 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents 2004</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady relationship 2011</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood 2011</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous motivation 2011</td>
<td>0 – 34</td>
<td>25.6 (6.7)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality alpha 2008</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>3.5 (0.5)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality beta 2008</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>3.5 (0.6)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\)Refers to missing data due to item non-response among those who participated in the respective wave; \(^b\)refers to missing data due to non-participation in the respective wave and item non-response combined.
Table 2

Mediation Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of parental occupational status</th>
<th>Civic Engagement 2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via extrinsic work values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via intrinsic work values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * \( p < .05, \) ** \( p < .01, \) *** \( p < .001. \)

Note. Confidence intervals for unstandardized coefficients (\( b \)) from a bias-corrected bootstrap with 1,000 random draws.
Figure 1. Results from a structural equation model testing the mediating role of work values in the relationship between parental occupational status and later civic engagement. Coefficients are standardized regression coefficients (β). Effects of covariates and manifest indicators of latent variables are omitted for clarity.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Appendix

Table A1

Survey Participation Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n present at 1st wave</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate, %</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present at 1st wave, %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table A2

*Standardized Loadings from the Latent Measurement Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifest indicators</th>
<th>Latent variable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>Work Values</td>
<td>Work Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Occupational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ occupational status 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers occupational status 2004</td>
<td>.68 (.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work Values**

- Good pay                                      - .02 (.03)       .74 (.03)
- Good opportunities for upgrading and promotions .19 (.04)       .58 (.03)
- Convenient working hours and good working conditions -.00 (.02)       .40 (.04)
- Promising employment prospects                   .06 (.04)       .53 (.04)
- Interesting work                                .81 (.03)       -.16 (.05)
- Learning opportunities                           .84 (.02)       .00 (.00)
- Match between job requirements and own abilities and strength .66 (.03)       .06 (.04)
- Varied work                                     .60 (.03)       .04 (.04)

**Civic Engagement**

- Donating money to an organization or charity     .49 (.03)
- Boycotting a product for ethical reasons         .58 (.03)
- Buying a product for ethical reasons             .68 (.03)
- Signing a petition                               .66 (.03)
- Participation in a demonstration                 .85 (.04)
- Partaking in a political event                   .69 (.03)
- Doing voluntary work                            .50 (.04)

*Note.* Standardized factor loadings (λ) with standard errors in parentheses. Meaningful loadings (λ ≥ .40 and p < .001) are set in bold. Parental occupational status and civic engagement were modeled as CFA factors; intrinsic and extrinsic work values were modeled as EFA factors.
Table A3

*Detailed Regression Results for the Path from Parental Occupational Status to Work Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Extrinsic work values 2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic work values 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal predictor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental occupational status 2004</td>
<td>−0.30*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodemographic control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary school sample</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>−0.11***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational track/attainment 2011</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment 2011</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties 2011</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents 2004</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady relationship 2011</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood 2011</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R²: 0.05* ***  0.06***

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.*
Table A4

*Detailed Regression Results for the Paths from Parental Occupational Status and Work Values to Civic Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Civic Engagement 2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focal predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental occupational status 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic work values 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic work values 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary school sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational track/attainment 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady relationship 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenthood 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous motivation 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality alpha 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality beta 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $R^2$ 0.37***

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.*