**Method**

# Participants and Procedures

Our data comprise two representative samples using multistage sampling in the region of South Moravia; one collected in 1995 (N=1127, 52% male) and the other from 2010 (N=1000, 47% male). Both samples comprise two age cohorts – grade 8 (mean age 14.6, 50.2% in 1995, 54.7% in 2010) and grade 10 (mean age 17.1). The proportion of males does not significantly differ between grades both in 1995 and 2010, **2(1) = 1.56 and .82 respectively. Respondents were administered a multi-page paper questionnaire comprising many items tapping their perceptions of the economy, local community, school, and their personal beliefs. In 2010, only a part of the 1995 questionnaire was administered. In 1995 the questionnaires were administered in school, in 2010 they were administered individually at home.

# Measures

Parents’ highest achieved education was measured on a three-category scale – primary school (up to grade 9), secondary school (high school, vocational school) and university education (bachelor degree or higher). Fathers’ and mothers’ education were summed into an indicator of parents’ education. In only 1.4% families in 1995 (1.7% in 2010) both parents had no higher education than primary. Most families are with one or both parents with secondary education (50.8% resp. 72.0%). Parents’ employment was measured by two summed dichotomous questions “*Does your mother/father have a job?*” Both parents have a job in 81% families in 1995 and in 77% in 2010. There were 1.9% and 1.4% families respectively with both jobless parents.

*Interest in domestic and international events* was measured by two highly correlated items (*How important is it for you to know about events in your country/in other countries? r* =.68) evaluated by the respondents on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 – quite unimportant to 5 – very important. The two items were combined into a summation scale by means of averaging them (same applies for the rest of the summation scales).

## Normative beliefs about society: The *economic equality* scale measured a belief that the society should be more egalitarian and that the welfare state should be promoted (e.g*. It is not correct that there are poor and rich in the society. There should be more of equality*. Cronbach’s *α* = .73) with respondents expressing their agreement on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 – certainly disagree to 5 – certainly agree (unless otherwise stated this response scale is used in all the subsequent items). The two-item *social welfare skepticism* scale tapped the worry that people tend to “slack” when the government provides for them (e.g. *If the state offers services for free people tend to get lazy/cheat.* *r* = .51). The *state non-responsibility* scale measured the belief that it is not the government, but the NGOs who should take care of the homeless (two items, e.g. *Homeless people should be taken care of by a church and charity organizations, not the state.* *r* = .54).

## Perceptions of current society: The *equal opportunities* scale measured a belief that the liberal ideal of equal opportunities has been accomplished in the society (two items; e. g. *If a person is willing to work hard, they can make a good living*. *r* = .42). The three-item *caring community* scale tapped whether the society was perceived as resembling to the communitarian ideal of helping and caring community (e.g. *If there is someone in our community with a problem he/she may count on the help of other people.*; Cronbach’s α= .70).

## Family functioning: Four items were combined into a scale of how much the respondent’s parents brought him/her up to help others, perceive their needs and sympathize with them – *socially responsible parenting* (e.g. *Parents taught me to be attentive to the needs of others, not only to those of mine.* Cronbach’s *α* = .73). A measure of how much respondents were brought up by their parents to rely on themselves was computed as a mean of another four items – *self-reliance parenting* (e.g. *Parents told me, that I should be independent a take care of myself in life.* Cronbach’s *α* = .59). *Positive relationship with parents* and the rest of the primary family was measured by four items (e.g. *Our family always made many things together*. Cronbach’s *α* = .54). Two items asked about how much parents respect respondents’ opinions – *mutual respect* (e.g. *If I give a good reason parents are willing to change their principles once in a while.* *r* = .41). The final two-item summation scale here is a measure of perceived *economic anxiety* experienced by the family (e.g. *My parents frequently worry how to pay bills.* *r* = .22).

## Value orientations: This section of the questionnaire measured how much some values or value orientations appear to be important for their future life. All value-orientation items were evaluated on a five-point scale from 1 – certainly unimportant to 5 – certainly important. *Social responsibility* value orientation of adolescents was measured on a five-item scale (e.g. *to do something useful for the society*; Cronbach’s *α* = .77). *Materialistic* value-orientation scale included five items (e.g. *to make a lot of money*; Cronbach’s *α* = .76). Five-item scale measured *environmental* value orientation of adolescents (e.g. *to do* *something to stop pollution*; Cronbach’s *α* = .81). The scale of *self-development/education* value orientation was based on three items (e.g. *to develop your talents*; Cronbach’s *α* = .68). Two items measured the *value of power or influence* for the respondent (e.g. *to influence the other people*; *r* = .44).

*School engagement* was measured by an eight-item scale (e.g. *Students are proud of their school.* Cronbach’s *α* = .81). One item, originally intended to be part of the school engagement scale, appears to be more independent, so we decided to use it as an individual scale. It measures the belief in teachers’ believing that every student can learn when he or she really tries – *equal treatment*.

## Perceptions of society structure: Respondents were shown five ordered diagrams representing the structure of society – welfare pyramids. In one extreme the diagram represented an elitist society with most people at the bottom of the society, almost none in the middle and some at the very top. In the other extreme there was a pyramid with very few people at the bottom, most people just below the top and still many people at the very top. Respondents marked, which diagram represents today’s Czech society, Czech society in 30 years, and an ideal for the Czech society.