



## Leisure, information needs and social participation of outskirts young people in Murcia (Spain)

VERA, Juan J.; LOPEZ-PINA, Jose. A.  
(Faculty of Psychology, Univ. Murcia) juverama@um.es

NAVARRO, Gabriel  
(Youth Depart., Murcia City Council)

### Abstract

*A representative stratified sample (age mean=22.7 years; sex: 50.8% males, 49.2% females) of 626 young people was randomly selected in a group of suburbs and minor rural localities (pedanías) of Murcia Borough (Spain). The outskirts young were interviewed and responded a wide questionnaire including among others a set of items already verified in conventional youth surveys. Means comparisons, factorial analysis and logistic regression (SPSS v. 14) summarize compile data. The aims of study were to explore practices and opinions about weekly and weekend leisure, information needs and problems and opportunities for social participation, in order to improve the action of a Youth Information Centre (InformaJoven).*

*Various and numerous are national studies on youth in Spain. A diversity of facets of the young people behaviour and opinion were described in specific literature, but a small number are about non-urban settings and much less information has been compiled on young people in suburbs and rural populations. Factor analysis reveals three components in leisure preferences and practices of outskirts young people. Moreover interesting results appear in relation to perception of information need and opportunities that influence their difficulties for social participation. Similarities and differences regarding other national samples of urban young people are considered.*

**Keywords:** social survey, participation, mobilisation, leisure, outskirts youth

### Introduction

Some authors affirm that diverse facts in the European countries are manifesting a group of strong social tendencies, which is connected to the new logic of the inequalities, and in those that the youths appear as special main characters and subject with an outstanding potentiality of prominence. (Díaz, 2007; Tezanos, 2007, p. 119). Also, they point out that it creates a new political agenda and arena that of the fights for the citizenship, which is understood as equal, full and universal citizenship (Tezanos, o.c.).

It is not only spoken of risks of the youths' political alienation in terms of more electoral abstention and high grade of organizational self-exclusion (for crisis

of interest and lack of credibility and motivations), but also in the context of the crisis of the social capital that affects the youth more. If a bigger social exclusion (juvenile unemployment, labour precariousness and irregularity, housing access difficulty, delay in the average age for emancipation) spreads to create a bigger political exclusion that is generating a citizenship of second category, more devaluated, limited and with less power. At the same time is proven in the last years the emergence of new forms of action, protests and mobilization, with a certain capacity of social and cultural impact just as sectorial social movements (feminists, against gender violence, squatters, anti-war of Iraq...), express actions (summoned by mobile phone or Internet),

mobilizations for concrete demands (worthy housing, labour or educational reforms, volunteers in the Prestige' catastrophe). In the Social Tendencies Surveys (v. Díaz, o.c.) are observed the progressive loss of importance of perceived power of the unions (although it has stayed stable regarding the political parties) and a vague presence or implication in both types of social organizations. However, more than half of the youth (under 30 years) recognize an increase of the influence of social movements and believes that they will follow having it in next decade.

### Objective

There is already a certain extent and tradition of national studies on youth in Spain and are numerous the works published on diversity of facets of the young people behaviour and opinion. However in a majority of cases the interviewees come from urban settings and much less information has compiled on young people in suburbs and rural populations.

A series of psychosocial variables (e.g. motivations and associative behaviour, perception and valuation of different forms of social participation and action), socio-demographic factors (age, sex, marital status, education, occupation) and locality's features (distance, population, socioeconomic domain) were interrelated in an wide study about non urban centre young people preferences and difficulties for the social participation and access to the information about juvenile topics and concerns.

### Design & Method

#### Persons

In 28 suburbs and pedanías (minor rural localities) of Murcia Borough (Spain) a representative stratified sample by age (mean=22.7 years, t.d.=4.35) and sex (50.8% males, 49.2% females) of 626 young people was randomly selected.

#### Measures

They were interviewed and responded a wide questionnaire including among others a set of items already verified in conventional youth studies in Spain. Data were analyzed by means comparisons, anova, factorial analysis and logistic regression with SPSS v. 14.

#### See

[http://www.informajoven.org/info/servicios/necesidades\\_info.html](http://www.informajoven.org/info/servicios/necesidades_info.html).

### Results

Valuation of the utility of the participation forms

In a range from 0 (nothing useful) to 10 (very useful) youngsters of the sample expressed their opinion on a series of forms of participation and social action. It is a field of usual content in youth surveys and it can adopt different formats. The alpha coefficient of the valuations of the utility of the participation forms was .84, indicating a high internal consistency (reliability) of the enquired youngsters' answers.

**Table 1. Perceived Utility of the participation forms (means in descending order)**

	All	Sex	
		M	Wr
To vote in elections	6.51	6.42	6.62
To Participate in a strike	6.28	6.29	6.26
To Go on a demonstration or concentration	6.16	6.21	6.10
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to an environmentalist, human rights associations, etc.	5.89	5.71	6.10
To Sign a petition, report or support text to something or somebody	5.67	5.52	5.84
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to a neighbourhood and local associations (* *)	5.65	5.38	5.95
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to an union	5.46	5.30	5.66
Frequently follow the political information in the media	4.79	4.67	4.93
Taking part in a boycott (*)	4.63	4.89	4.35
Taking over a building	4.51	4.75	4.24
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to a political party	4.49	4.43	4.56
Frequently defend and speak of political topics with other people	4.14	4.11	4.18
Try to convince somebody that he/she votes or joins to a party	3.39	3.37	3.41
Direct Actions that could involve violence	1.61	1.73	1.48

(\*) p<.05-- (\*\*) p<.01 Significance by sex

If we observe the average ranking of different forms of social participation-action, we notice that the three first in average are usual and conventional forms of participation within the usual democratic system. All with the shade of being precise actions, the one at the moment of the call (elections, strike, and demonstrations) is done and the later dedication or more extended commitment is unknown or it is not possible to be inferred. One of the four following (with a medium level of average approval of utility) follows the same style as the first three (signing a request...) and it is also identified, nowadays, as a conventional operation although some decades ago it was described as a non-conventional political activity in the studies on new forms of political participation (v. Albach, 1989; Baker, Dalton y Hildebrandt, 1981; Bynner y Ashford, 1994; Deth, 1990; Gibbins, 1989; Tarrow, 1988). The other three forms in this position state the membership and collaboration with organisations or participation entities (but not a political party specifically) and imply a more constant commitment, even remaining in the parameters of the conventional social or civic action. Below the subjective average score of approval

(below 5) there would be forms of commitment or both conventional (belonging to a party, convincing to vote or joining a party) and non conventional (taking part in a boycott, taking over a building, direct action that could involve violence) and the informative or communicative commitment (mental or cognitive activism). Activities such as proselytism and specially direct action with the possibility of violence are not approved by respondents.

We can verify that the differences based on sex are only significant in two items: girls more than boys consider more useful belonging and collaborating with local associations. The participation in a boycott is considered more useful by boys than girls. By age groups, differences in the average of utility of the different forms or actions of social participation focus on:

- Youngsters in the interval of more age (>24 years) stand out in almost all items that are significant, whose averages are ordered in size as the age increases. Thus, they emphasise collaboration with a union, voting, following the political information, defending and dealing with political subjects, trying to convince and to affiliate, and collaborating with a party. Almost all of them can be fitted in what we consider conventional political behaviour.
- The exception to the previous rule occurs in collaborating with local associations where youngsters of intermediate and lower age stand out.

However, a different view is shown by the classification by educational level reached in the crossing of categories with the different forms of action or social participation. A relatively wide number of items show significant differences; yet, preferences reflect different directions:

- The higher the level of education is, higher utility level perceived in company/signature requests and voting in the elections, But that increasing order up to the highest score of those who have higher education does not occur with equal precision in following political information, defending and talking about politics, convincing and joining a party, collaborating- belonging to a party.
- Those who have studied vocational training stand out in collaborating with local associations, and attending a demonstration.
- Those who have no education or these are the basic one, are before the others (often followed by those who have studied vocational training) in

collaborating with a union, participating in a boycott, taking over a building.

**Table 2. Perceived Utility of the participation forms (means)**

	Education			
	Primary	Vocational training	Secondary	University
To sign a petition, report or support text to something or somebody (**)	4.93	5.78	5.87	6.29
To collaborate/ Affiliate to a neighbourhood and local associations (*)	5.65	6.31	5.02	5.92
To collaborate/ Affiliate to an union (**)	5.91	5.81	4.56	5.75
Taking part in a boycott (**)	5.63	5.49	3.39	4.24
To go on a demonstration or concentration (**)	6.21	6.70	6.12	5.66
To vote in elections (**)	6.09	6.46	6.61	7.03
Taking over a building (**)	5.65	5.33	3.07	4.26
Frequently follow the political information in the media (**)	4.57	4.99	4.34	5.56
Frequently defend and speak of political topics with other people (**)	4.05	4.40	3.43	4.99
Try to convince somebody that he/she votes or joins to a party (**)	3.68	3.75	2.47	3.92
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to a political party (**)	3.77	4.54	4.42	5.48

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

Following table shows the factorial analysis of main components with Varimax rotation that revealed the existence of three basic factors which motivate valuations of the utility of participation forms. From them, new variables are created:

**Table 3. Factorial Structure of utility of participation forms (Varimax Rotation. Factor Analysis)**

	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
To Sign a petition, report or support text to something or somebody	0.551	----	----
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to a neighbourhood and local associations	0.762	----	----
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to an environmentalist, human rights associations, etc.	0.825	----	----
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to an union	0.421	0.396	----
Taking part in a boycott	----	0.897	----
To Go on a demonstration or concentration	0.431	0.554	----
To vote in elections	0.415	----	0.428
To Participate in a strike	----	0.529	----

Taking over a building	----	0.788	----
Frequently follow the political information in the media	----		0.732
Frequently defend and speak of political topics with other people	----		0.810
Try to convince somebody that he/she votes or joins to a party	----		0.713
To Collaborate/ Affiliate to a political party	----		0.650
Direct Actions that could involve violence	----		
Variance explained	32.24	33.87	33.89
Guttman-Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	.77	.81	.82

- Variable UTIL1 (Factor I) results from adding the answers given by people to options 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 of that question. It includes the perception-valuation of favourable forms of civic action to the collaboration-membership to different types of associations (from local ones to unions), and it also has a certain preference for conventional forms of participation (signing requests, attending a demonstration, voting in elections).
- Variable UTIL2 (Factor II) results from adding the answers given by people to options 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9. This factor groups answers that are related to more radical or less conventional cut actions (participating in a boycott, taking over a building, taking part in strikes and demonstrations and collaborating- belonging to a union).
- Variable UTIL3 (Factor III) results from adding the answers given by people to options 7, 10, 11, 12 and 13. Here, answers related to the partisan political participation are included (convincing to vote or to join a party, belonging to it, following the political information and defending and talking about these subjects, voting in elections).

**Actions by which the young people would mobilise themselves**

Youngsters are asked about their reasons for mobilisation, and they are allowed to answer one or more of the items. This factor in different formats is usual in youth surveys and is an indirect referent of values or social rights they wish (employment, distribution of wealth, security, equality, protection of the weak ones, environment, peace, etc.). The results show a percentage of those polled have mentioned that item.

**Table 4. Actions by which the young people mobilise**

**themselves (% in descending order)**

	All	Sex M	W
1. Finding a job	81.5%	52.4%	47.6%
2. Housing	53.7%	43.8%	56.3%
3. Improving public services (Education., Health)	53.0%	48.5%	51.5%
4. Avoiding delinquency	43.9%	49.5%	50.5%
5. Better distribution of the wealth	40.9%	47.3%	52.7%
6. Protecting weak ones rights	37.4%	48.3%	51.8%
7. Obtaining peace (end of wars)	32.4%	48.3%	51.7%
8. Protecting the environment	28.8%	46.7%	53.3%
9. Defending Spain	25.6%	53.7%	46.3%
10. Preserving my right to have fun	21.7%	60.3%	39.7%
11. To do what I feel like, I want	16.8%	55.2%	44.8%
12. To defend my religious and/or moral convictions	16.6%	44.2%	55.8%
13. To prevent the immigrants from taking away our things	15.7%	59.2%	40.8%
14. To improve the situation of the immigrants	08.9%	46.4%	53.6%

**Observation of ranking of expressed reasons shows that:**

Finding a job is, by far, the most widespread preoccupation or motivation. Housing and improving public services are equal in proportion. In a third place, relatively close we would find avoiding delinquency and a better distribution of the wealth. More altruistic aspirations are located in central positions of the ranking: protecting the weak ones, obtaining peace, protecting the environment and defending Spain. It attracts our attention the low percentage of follow-through of some items that have tendencies and directions of evaluative or social positioning: right to have fun, to do what I want; to prevent the immigrants from taking away our things, and in another aspect to defend moral and religious convictions and to improve the situation of the immigrants.

Also, it is possible to carry out a factorial analysis of answers to verify if components or interpretable dimensions in preferences of the enquired youngsters are created. The Varimax rotation offers three components that have created new variables in the question regarding motivations for the social mobilisation.

- Component MOVIL1 (Factor I): it groups answers and preferences that in literature on

values and social attitudes have been bound to a social universalistic-justice orientation (v. Gouveia, 2001, Schwartz, 2001, Vera 1995, Vera, Martín, Martínez y Paterna, 2004) where the others' well-being is the main concern, together with the environment and to go beyond selfish interests (the own well-being goes together with the social and ecological welfare, it has components of altruistic or post-materialistic ethics).

- Component MOVIL2 (Factor II): it gathers items that show a more ego and ethnocentric position, the aim is to preserve rights of hedonistic or individualistic type, and to protect the in- group of external threats.
- Component MOVIL3 (Factor III): here answers are concentrated that are not polarised in the other ends (neither in the collectivist of universalistic type nor in the defensive individualist), it is about preoccupations and personal interests but which are designed for the social sphere or they need the harmony or well-being in society: housing, job, peace, public services, security.

**Table 5. Factor Analysis. Varimax Rotated Components Matrix**

	Component		
	1	2	3
Better distribution of the wealth	,634	,078	,051
To improve the situation of the immigrants	,625	,064	-,030
Protecting weak ones rights	,609	-,030	,194
Protecting the environment	,516	,163	,411
To defend my religious and/or moral convictions	,511	,013	,066
To do what I feel like, I want	,288	,678	-,148
Defending Spain	-,114	,646	,404
Preserving my right to have fun	,310	,613	-,119
To prevent the immigrants from taking away our things	-,273	,557	,087
Housing	-,035	-,048	,632
Obtaining peace (end of wars)	,292	,395	,549
Avoiding delinquency	,161	,290	,505
Improving public services (Education., Health)	,232	,041	,502
Finding a job	-,031	-,221	,446

The contrast of proportions of mention (how many

see in the successive items a reason for action) based on sex does not offer significant differences in many of the questions. Yet, they do appear in defending right to have fun much more extended among boys than girls (p=.012); and also in being able to have access to housing where girls surpass boys (p=.000).

According to the age groups, the most relevant differences are the following ones:

- As the age increases, there exists more motivation to be able to have access to housing.
- As the age increases, there exists less motivation to improve for the conditions of the immigrants, to preserve the right to have fun, protection of the environment, to be able to do what you want.
- The 20-24 year-old group, followed by >24 years, are more motivated to be able to find a job: (a 88% and 82.6% as opposed to 72.4%)
- The youngest group is the one that points out avoidance of delinquency (14 percentage points over: 54.6%), followed by the other two groups almost in the same magnitude (around a 40% of each group)

According to the categories of occupation, it is possible to find remarkable differences in the proportion of youngsters of each sub-group that emphasises these motivations for the mobilisation. It seems that:

- The two groups that work have more motivation to find a job, being ten percentage points under the other two groups.
- The two groups that study make more emphasis in preserving their right to have fun, in protecting the environment, and in a certain way also in improving the conditions of the immigrants and achieving the end of wars (in these reasons the proportion decreases as we go from group 1 to 4). Also defending the rights of the weakest and best distribution of the wealth (here the group that studies and works stands out).
- In being able to do what they want the group that study and the one that neither works nor studies stand out, being in a lower position the group that works.
- The grouping of the people of the sample according to their level of education obtained so far, shows differences in almost all the items in this variable (all but three) regarding the reasons to mobilise themselves. This doesn't mean that all the differences are

equally intense, neither ordered nor proportional. Although in general it would be possible to say that there is much motivation for the mobilisation in those who have secondary education in most items, they are the ones who would mobilise more or the second ones in doing so.

**Obstacles that hinder the participation of youngsters (PART)**

The analysis of the obstacles that, in the own perception of the respondents, hinder the social participation of youngsters offers interesting considerations.

*Table 6. Obstacles that hinder participation of youngsters (%)*

	All	Sex M	W
PA1 The legal framework that regulates the processes of civic participation	11.3%	60.6%	39.4%
PA2 The lack of education and culture for the participation	30.7%	47.9%	52.1%
PA3 The demotivation, youngsters don't want to participate, "this is not good for anything"	50.0%	47.6%	52.4%
PA4 The institutional inflexibility	14.5%	50.5%	49.5%
PA5 Lack of spaces, premises and time for the participation	27.8%	46.6%	53.4%
PA6 The dominant social values: individualism, competitiveness, consumerism, comfort, conformism	27.8%	44.3%	55.7%
PA7 Few participation means exist, and they are not well-known or they are not used well	39.0%	49.6%	50.4%
PA8 The time that I devote to Internet or video games	5.0%	61.3%	38.7%
PA9 The institutions don't favour the participation. I believe that don't exist a clear political will of fomenting it...	14.1%	56.8%	43.2%

Firstly, (see the table below) it is outstanding the significant role that is attributed to the participative demotivation, apathy or disillusion. Half of the sample points out that this obstacle, a difficulty if you want to call it internal, is typical of the section of population that is being surveyed. The other difficulty, purely internal, devotion to the Internet or videogames, it is hardly admitted by a 5%.

The other outstanding factors of difficulty are of two types, some infrastructural or instrumental, other normative or cultural ones. This way, the lack of means or its ignorance or misuse, almost reaches 40% of the mentions of the respondents, and also the lack of spaces, premises and time is outstanding in 27.8%. The cultural and educative deficiencies and the prevailing values (whereas they promote lack of social commitment) are outstanding in 30.7% and 27.8%. The institutional problems such as the institutional inflexibility, the lack of will or participative facilitation and the legal framework also bring together non despicable percentages (14.5%, 14.1% and 11.3%, respectively).

These data can also be read under another classification:

- Motivational Factors (that include the values or goals socially valid and desirable) and cultural ones (education and culture for the participation), that would have more to do with the participative mentality and conscience. The difficulty would lie in the absence of a construction of participative citizen conscience.
- Factors for the support or canalization of the participation: means, spaces, institutions that support, norms that facilitate, etc. The difficulty would lie in the deficiencies, bad design or inflexibility in the social infrastructure for the participation.

If we take sex into account for the perception of the difficulties, we should point out that the differences are not significant, with the exception of the difficulty regarding the prevailing social values that oppose the social implication and participation. In this case, 31.5% of the girls stand out this difficulty as opposed to the 24.2% of the boys. The variable age does not offer enough elements of comparison among groups of youngsters based on the difficulty of participation. Perhaps we should point out that those over 24 years old internally emphasise a little more than the other groups that precede them the problem of the legal framework (15.8% as opposed to 7.8% and 8.6%) and of the predominant social values (of more or less age the percentages are 33.2%, 24.4% and 23.6%). That the 20-24 –year-old group is the one that less mentions the lack of education and culture of participation (23.3% as opposed to 32.2%, 35.1%). , Nevertheless, the youngest (< 20 years) are those that less see the problem of the lack of motivation (38.5% in this group as opposed to 50.8% and 57.1% in the age groups that follow them). It

could possibly be said that the older the enquired youngsters are, and not strictly in a linear way, the higher the perceptions of demotivation, unfavourable values, etc.

If we consider the level of education, we find a panorama of diversity of intragroup profiles but which does not seem to point at a fixed direction. At most, we can point out some contrasts between the percentages of the two first groups as opposed to the second ones (that is to say, without basic education and vocational training, as contrasted with secondary school and college students). For example, the difficulties with the means of participation are emphasized by the 46% of the youngsters of the two first educational levels, whereas in the two second ones it decreases down to about 32%. It is the other way round with the lack of motivation of youngsters: a 56.6% and a 55.5% of secondary school and college students, respectively, emphasise this factor, whereas in titleholders in VT it decreases to 48.4% and 43.3% in basic education or without education. Also the difficulty with predominant social values is relevant in the third and fourth group than in the two first ones (36.4% and 30% as opposed to 22.9% and 21.4%).

The contrast of percentages of youngsters who point out a certain factor of difficulty based on their classification by occupation does not offer relevant differences between them.

**Correlations between utility and mobilisation components and perceptions of difficulty for the participation.**

The correlations matrix that appears below summarises to what extent utility variables and why young people would mobilise themselves are related to each other and with the difficulty to participate. In this sense it is outstanding that:

Table 7. Correlations

		util1	util2	util3	movil1	movil2	movil3
util1	Pearson corr.	1					
	Sig. (bilateral)						
util2	Pearson corr.	,590(**)	1				
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000					
util3	Pearson corr.	,564(**)	,310(**)	1			
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000	,000				
movil1	Pearson corr.	,191(**)	-,052	,085(*)	1		
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000	,226	,046			
movil2	Pearson corr.	-,039	-,073	-,046	,203(**)	1	
	Sig. (bilateral)	,361	,090	,284	,000		
movil3	Pearson corr.	,115(**)	-,178(**)	,010	,345(**)	,270(**)	1
	Sig. (bilateral)	,007	,000	,823	,000	,000	
part	Pearson corr.	,151(**)	,153(**)	,064	,258(**)	-,009	,247(**)
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000	,000	,134	,000	,815	,000

\*\* Significance to a 0,01 level (bilateral). \* Significance to a 0,05 level (bilateral).

There exists a significant, positive and moderately high relation among UTIL1 and UTIL2 and UTIL3

(the two other profiles of perception of social utility). That is to say, between the perceptions of utility of the participation related to associations and other conventional and not so conventional forms of participation and social action. This is so because they even share some item in their configuration. Nevertheless, the relation between UTIL2 and UTIL3 is positive but lower. There is less correlation between the less conventional style (alternative or not integrated) and the most partisan one (bound to political parties and to the political proselytism).

There exists a significant, positive and more moderate relation among the three components identified in reasons for the mobilisation, which can be considered coherent with the interpretation on social directions, values and attitudes that is usual on the matter. The citizens can consider valid or useful different ways of social participation-action (understood as means of action), even though those means are varied and can involve some kind of complication from the point of view of the more or less conventional democratic participation. What it is not so understandable is that the aims or reasons for that participation (action or reaction) can, in their diverse nature, be compatible, since there can be values and goals or social aspirations to a certain extent incompatible or difficult to harmonise.

Therefore, it is logical to some extent that between MOVIL1 and MOVIL3 (that is, for universalistic and personal-social well-being reasons) the highest positive correlation occurs (.345) and that, in addition, it is higher than the rest of correlations, and that there exists a more limited coincidence or correlation (although also positive) with MOVIL2 (respectively .203 and .270) that was related to more hedonists, individualistic and ethnocentric reasons. In the sample studied, however, we notice that the three groups of motivations for the social action are associated positively (there are no negative correlations among them), which can be indicative that some citizens can have a heterogeneous and dependent profile of motivations of different directions (defending some social interests and simultaneously some privative or protectionist ones), and that there can also be incongruence among such preferences.

Much lower and sometimes negative are the correlations between the variables of utility of the participation and the reasons to mobilise. Thus, UTIL1 (it values conventional associations and civic actions) is significantly related to MOVIL1 (universalistic and pro-social motivation) and a little less to MOVIL3 (concern about personal interests

with social projection). It does not happen (and the tendency is negative) with MOVIL2 (more individualistic or defensive motivations). UTIL2 (valuation of less conventional actions) is negatively related to MOVIL3 (the motivation for the personal and social well-being — social work, housing, peace, security and social services). The valuation of the utility of the partisan political participation (UTIL3) is very slightly related to the motivation for universalistic or pro-social type (MOVIL1).

When affirming the existence of more obstacles that hinder participation (PART) the number of youngsters who value more profiles of participation UTIL1 and UTIL2 is outstanding (associative-conventional and less conventional) and also specially those whose answers are grouped in component MOVIL1 (motivations of universalistic-egalitarian type) and MOVIL3 (it gathers motivations of personal and social welfare type: work, housing, peace, security).

Obstacles that hinder the participation of youngsters according to socio-demographic and social participation-mobilisation variables.

The table below reflects the profiles of factors that hinder the participation of youngsters in groups (selected from each logistic regression analysis those who obtained statistical meaning to  $n.s. \leq .05$ ,  $R^2$  Nagelkerke non-higher than .220, and global percentage of correct classification of cases around a 70%).

Table 8. Coefficients of logistic regression analysis.

	Sex	Age	Util1	Util2	Util3	Movil1	Movil2	Movil3
PA1	-.792			.044				
PA2				.032			-.326	.339
PA3		.065				1.159		.242
PA4						-.239		.635
PA5			-.056	.072	.031	.234	-.248	.292
PA6		.063			-.040	.372	-.418	
PA7			-.054	.057	.046	.250		
PA8			-.070			.519		
PA9				.055				

The most outstanding interpretations are:

- The first and last difficulty: legal framework that regulates the participation and the institutions does not favour the participation does not allow a fitted and reliable regression equation with the considered covariables (although some of them as UTIL2 seem to have some kind of positive relation with them).
- Mentioning lack of education and culture for the participation has a more moderate negative association with MOVIL2 (a more defensive profile of motivations for

mobilisation). It is also positively related to MOVIL3 (pro common citizen rights) and very slightly to UTIL2 (it values the less conventional social participation-action).

- The difficulty lack of motivation, youngsters do not want to participate, this is useless, has a strong positive association with MOVIL1, that is, it is more mentioned by youngsters who assign to a profile of universalistic right mobilisation pro and of social justice (perhaps as a complaint or reaction for their aspirations) and slighter but also positive with MOVIL3 (mobilisation by usual constitutional rights). The positive relation with the age is hardly remarkable.
- Inflexibility of public institutions, is remarkably related, in a positive way, to profile MOVIL3 (more emphasized by these respondents) and in a negative way, more moderately, to MOVIL1.
- Lack of spaces, premises and time for the participation is the difficulty indicator that more relation has with the different covariables, although not all of equal magnitude and importance. Thus, in a positive way, it is more mentioned when there is a profile of mobilisation MOVIL3 is had (by more usual rights of well-being) and MOVIL1 (profile social universalistic-justice), and very slightly with UTIL2 and UTIL3 (they value non-conventional or bound to parties participation). Negatively, with profile MOVIL2 (more endogrupal defensive) and very scarcely with UTIL1 (valued participation of associations and conventional action).
- Mentioning that the predominant social values are not favourable to the participation is, in contrast, associated with two profiles of mobilisation. In a positive way with those of MOVIL1 (of a social universalistic-justice orientation that are more critical with these values and mention more often this difficulty). In a negative way with MOVIL2 (more hedonistic and in-group biased) that mentions less, and very scarcely with MOVIL3.
- The perception that there are few means of participation, and those that we have are not known or they are not well used is related positively but in a moderate way to MOVIL1, UTIL2 and UTIL3, as well as to the minor size of population, and very slightly in negative

with UTIL1 (the inclined ones to the conventional and associative participation notice this difficulty less).

- Pointing out the time that I devote to the Internet or video-games is remarkably related to, and is, to a certain point contradictory, to MOVIL1 (universalistic motivation) and very little, in negative, with UTIL1 (it values the conventional associative and civic participation). **Weekly and week-end leisure patterns and social mobilisation and participation** The factorial analysis identified a three-dimensional structure in the answers of the interviewees relating to activities that they made with their friends during the week, and which they have been transformed into new grouping variables as is specified now: OCIO1 (factor I that include/understand items 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 14) that it has to do basically with activities related to the computer, videogames and Internet, although also get up activities like watching, go out with friends and to practice sport. OCIO2 (factor II that includes items 9, 11, 13, 15 and 16) relating to activities of cultural type, such as to go to the cinema, to visit museums, to attend exhibitions and to make trips or excursions.

OCIO3 (factor III that includes items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) reveals a sedentary pattern of activities where the study is included, and not directly concerning with the computers or Internet.

Table 9. Factorial structure of leisure activities realised during week

	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III
1. Online Chat	0.733	----	----
2. Surfing the Net (no chat)	0.708	----	----
3. Listen to Radio	----	----	0.566
4. Read books, magazines, comics	----	----	0.801
5. Study	----	----	0.404
6. Listening to CDs, audiotapes, etc.	0.426	----	0.518
7. Watch TV	0.536	----	0.368
8. Play video-console games, etc.	0.650	----	----
9. Visit museums, exhibitions, etc.	----	0.502	0.370
10. Go to PC games rooms	0.342	----	----
11. Go to live music concerts	----	0.678	----
12. Go out with friends	0.501	----	----
13. Travel, go on a day trip	----	0.627	----
14. Practice sport	0.466	----	----
15. Go to disco, pubs, etc.	----	0.564	----
16. Go to cinema, theatre, etc.	----	0.684	----
17. Collaborate on associations, NGOs	----	----	----
Variance explained	15.68	13.03	11.37

Also, the factorial analysis revealed a two-dimensional structure of leisure on weekend which allows creating two new variables to summarize data:

OCIO4 (that groups gathered activities in items 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14 and 15) have to do with computers, videogames and Internet, besides to go out with

friends, to watch, to go to disco and to practice sport; OCIO5 (contains items 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13 and 16) groups activities that are related to studying, listening to radio and tapes, to visit museums, to go music concerts and go to cinema or theatre.

It is possible to consider interrelation between the leisure factors with the factors grouped in participation or social action evaluation and motivations for mobilisation variables. The next table shows correlations between these variables.

Table 10. Correlations between leisure, mobilisation and participation patterns

		movil1	movil2	movil3	util1	util2	util3
OCio1	Pearson corr.	,021	,337(**)	,246(**)	-,132(*)	-,198(**)	-,083
	Sig. (bilateral)	,691	,000	,000	,017	,000	,137
OCio2	Pearson corr.	,132(*)	,208(**)	-,008	,022	,023	,086
	Sig. (bilateral)	,014	,000	,880	,690	,682	,122
OCio3	Pearson corr.	,232(**)	,232(**)	,422(**)	,132(*)	-,241(**)	,166(**)
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000	,000	,000	,017	,000	,002
OCio4	Pearson corr.	,016	,308(**)	,176(**)	-,160(**)	-,133(*)	-,075
	Sig. (bilateral)	,770	,000	,001	,004	,016	,176
OCio5	Pearson corr.	,180(**)	,030	,187(**)	,100	-,202(**)	,224(**)
	Sig. (bilateral)	,001	,585	,000	,072	,000	,000

Concerning pattern OCIO1, a positive relation with MOVIL2 is observed, that is to say, with motivations of endogrupal and hedonistic defensive nature and also with MOVIL3, preoccupation by basic individual rights of well-being. Nevertheless, correlation is negative and practically null with factors of valuation of the social participation-action, especially with UTIL2 (less conventional participation) and UTIL1 (associative participation).

OCIO2 correlates also, although more moderately than the previous one, with MOVIL2 (defensive mobilisation) and hardly with MOVIL1 (universalistic and social justice mobilisation), which indicates that it occurs slightly in both motivacionales profiles; but not in a significant way with the factors of utility of the social participation.

The third pattern of weekly leisure (OCIO3) is going to correlate with all the factors considered here. In negative with UTIL2 (the valuation of the participation of less conventional court partially is against this scheme of leisure). In positive and outstanding form with MOVIL3 and more slightly with the rest of factors. This can be interpreted, partly, because this pattern of leisure does not reflect a clear differentiation between mobilisation schemes (although is notable on the basic citizen rights oriented one).

About leisure on week-ends, OCIO4 behaves like OCIO1: positive and moderate relation with MOVIL2 and insignificant with MOVIL3 as well negligible and negative correlations with valuation profiles of social participation ways. On the other

hand, OCIO5 approaches the scheme of OCIO3, but generally with less in size and number of correlations. Outstanding correlations are: positive with UTIL3 and negative with UTIL2.

### Conclusions

The social and political participation of the young people in rural habitats seems to move away of the party conventional forms, to be oriented to more precise or immediate actions and towards a tenuous one and not very extended collaboration with civic associations [As it confirms the data on associativism not analysed in this paper]. The most radical forms of direct action do not receive acceptance either.

The motivations and values for the mobilisation that the interviewed young people declare are oriented to reach or to preserve individual rights of well-being and social benefits. Minor is the motivation towards more universalistic aims or of social justice and a more minority group of the sample of young people points at individualistic motivations of hedonistic and defensive type.

The main attributions on difficulties for the participation fall to deficiencies of two types: on the one hand, motivations, confidence and participative culture of the young people (and within this one the presence of dominant values opposite to the social commitment), On the other hand, lack of resources, means, spaces, supports, etc., for the participation. The young people recognise their own deficiencies facing the social implication although also they indicate to the society and the institutions like little favourable to participation.

The interrelations between factors of mobilisation, utility of different participation forms and the difficulties that the young people find to participate are diverse and complex. The slight relation can be emphasised (but significant) that they have the profiles of perception of utility with some of the participative difficulties, and a more remarkable and clear relation with the motives and orientations for the mobilisation specially the universalistic and social justice orientation, as well as the individual rights and social welfare orientation.

### References

- Albach, P.G. (Ed.) (1989). *Student political activism: An International Reference Handbook*. Greenwood Press.
- Baker, K.; Dalton R.J. y Hildebrant, K. (1981). *Germany transformed: Political culture and the new politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Bynner, J. y Ashford, S. (1994). Politics and participation: Some antecedents of young people's attitudes to the political system and political activity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 223- 236;
- Deth, J.W. van (1990). Interest in politics. In M.K. Jennings; J.W. Deth et al. *Continuities in political action: A longitudinal study of political orientations in three Western democracies*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Díaz Moreno, V. (2007). Los jóvenes y las nuevas formas de movilización social y política. *Sistema*, 197/198, 283-295.
- Gibbins J. R. (Ed.) (1989). *Contemporary Political Culture. Politics in a Postmodern Age*. Londres: Sage.
- Gouveia, V. (2001). El individualismo y el colectivismo normativo: comparación de dos modelos. En M. Ros y V. Gouveia (coords.). *Psicología social de los valores humanos. Desarrollos teóricos, metodológicos y aplicados*, (pp. 101-125). Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Schwartz, S.H. (2001). ¿Existen aspectos universales en la estructura y contenido de los valores humanos? En M. Ros y V. Gouveia (coords.). *Psicología social de los valores humanos. Desarrollos teóricos, metodológicos y aplicados*, (pp. 53-77). Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Tarrow, S. (1988). National politics and collective action: Recent theory and research in Western Europe and United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 421-440.
- Tezanos, J.F. (2007). *Juventud, ciudadanía y exclusión social*. *Sistema*, 197/198, 103-119.
- Vera, J.J. (1995). *Sistemas de valores y compromiso social de los jóvenes*. Tesis doctoral. Dpto. de Psiquiatría y Psicología Social. Universidad de Murcia. Servicio de Publicaciones: CD-Rom "Ciencias Experimentales"(1997).
- Vera, J.J.; Martín, M.P.; Martínez, M.C. y Paterna, C. (2004). ¿Más allá de la Generación X? Niveles de compromiso social y prioridades en el sistema de valores en universitarios. En A. Sánchez, A. Zambrano y M. Palacín (Eds.), *Psicología Comunitaria europea: comunidad, poder, ética y valores* (44-59). Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.
- Wallace, C., Spanning, R. & Haerpfer Ch. (2003). *Jóvenes ciudadanos: la integración política y*

social de la juventud en Europa Oriental y Occidental. En J.Benedicto y M.L: Morán.

Aprendiendo a ser ciudadanos. Madrid: INJUVE.