

Eötvös Loránd University
Faculty of Law
Doctoral School of Political Science

Csongor Fényes
**Political Socialization Pathways among Young Members
of the Momentum Movement**

– Doctoral Dissertation Theses –

Supervisors:
Dr. Andrea Szabó, Dr. István Stumpf

Table of content

1.	The topic of the dissertation and the research questions.....	2
2.	Theoretical framework	2
3.	Methodology and data collection	4
4.	Research questions	5
5.	Findings.....	6
6.	Conclusions and limitations of the dissertation	14
7.	References	17

1. The topic of the dissertation and the research questions

The dissertation starts from the well-established finding that Hungarian youth exhibit persistently low levels of political interest and political participation, a pattern consistently reported by both domestic and international research over the past decade (Kadlót 2016; Bauer et al. 2017; Bíró-Nagy–Szabó A. 2021). Studies, however, also repeatedly show that there exists a small, 1–2% segment characterized by high political interest and genuine, institutionalized participation. Instead of analyzing the absence of participation, the dissertation asks what socialization processes, turning points, and contextual conditions make it possible for a young person in Hungary to become an active and agentic political actor.

Within this framework, Momentum and its youth organization, Momentum TizenX, constitute a particularly relevant case study. The formation that emerged after 2016 was created by young founders with the explicit aim of reaching young people growing up in highly educated, urban environments (Tóth 2018). The political community functioned as an “entry party”: for many of its members it was the first political community they joined, offering a rare opportunity to reconstruct socialization pathways leading to political activism. The dissertation explicitly examines this “invisible” 1–2%: young people who, despite dominant patterns of passivity, enter the world of party politics.

The dissertation draws on multi-wave quantitative and qualitative data collection conducted between 2017 and 2025, enabling comparisons across political socialization trajectories of different age cohorts. The research aims, first, to identify what channels, life events, and interactional practices lead to the emergence of political interest and activism and, indirectly, to joining the organization; and second, to understand how these trajectories relate to international ideal types of democratic political socialization (Torney–Purta 2002). A declared limitation of the dissertation is that it focuses exclusively on young members of Momentum and Momentum TizenX; it is therefore not representative either of the full party membership or of Hungarian youth. At the same time, it provides a concentrated “deep drill” that can serve as a reference point for future comparative research.

2. Theoretical framework

The dissertation conceptualizes political socialization as a lifelong learning process through which individuals acquire the norms, values, behavioral patterns, and competencies necessary for social coexistence (Szabó I. 2009; Percheron 1999). Within this, political socialization refers to the process through which a member of society becomes a political being – a citizen capable of navigating and acting within institutional structures (Hess–Torney 1967; Szabó M. 2001). According to classical approaches, the knowledge, affective, and value dimensions of political culture (Almond–Verba 1963) are internalized through socialization and, in the long run, shape civic behavior.

Early models often followed a “*top-down*” logic, describing children as passive recipients while parents and institutions appeared as active shapers (Kéri 1989). Later critiques (Percheron 1999; Searing et al. 1973; Neundorf–Smets 2017) emphasized, first, that the durability of childhood attitudes was often overestimated and, second, that the individual’s active and reflexive role was undervalued: political socialization is not a closed episode but an interaction with the social environment that spans the entire life course. Consequently, more recent

research describes the process as a multi-directional, interactive system in which, alongside the classical four agents – family, school, peer group, and media – new arenas (eg.: religion, social movements, online platforms, digitally networked participatory cultures) also play a role (Neundorf–Smets 2017; Jenkins et al. 2016). Recent international findings suggest that young people often acquire skills-debating, narrative-building, conflict management- in informal, networked, experience-based communities, which later become the foundation of political participation (Theocharis 2015; Vaccari et al. 2015; Kahne–Bowyer 2018; Wineburg et al. 2016).

In the Hungarian context, research on political socialization has only partially institutionalized: studies beginning in the 1970s and intensifying around the regime change focused primarily on the intersection of school, family, and youth attitudes (Szabó I. 1991; Csákó 2017). The dissertation follows these approaches; accordingly, within the theoretical framework, special emphasis is placed on the family; the school (formal and informal arenas, student councils); gender roles and political self-concept; and peer groups and deliberative culture. Regarding the family, the dissertation builds not on classical one-directional models but on approaches emphasizing mutual, two-way politicization: young people not only receive but also shape their parents' political views, and shared class position, lifestyle, and place of residence substantially influence political similarities (Hooghe–Stiers 2020; Wong–Tseng 2008; York 2019).

In the case of the school arena, the dissertation distinguishes between formal dimensions (civic education embedded in curricula and lesson structures) and informal dimensions (classroom interactions, the hidden curriculum, teacher–student communication, student councils). The roles of teachers, classroom debates, lesson-based discourse, and student councils in political learning are interpreted with attention to gender differences: how girls' and boys' political self-confidence, willingness to speak up, and forms of participation develop differently. With regard to peer groups, the dissertation assumes that young people's political self-image, language, and repertoires of conflict management are shaped to a significant extent by everyday disputes, shared experiences, and collective action attempts with age peers. Online arenas, in the dissertation's interpretation, are not autonomous, isolated fields of socialization, but mediating channels built upon existing offline relationships and debates. The theoretical framework therefore does not posit a separate “*online socialization*” process; rather, it assumes an intertwining of offline and online spaces and approaches the political learning of Momentum youth from this perspective.

In sum, the dissertation's theoretical starting point is that political socialization is a multi-directional process that does not end in time, in which formal and informal influences continuously build on one another, reinforcing or overwriting each other's effects. The dissertation interprets the socialization pathways of young members of Momentum and TizenX within this complex, semi-peripheral, and fragmented framework.

3. Methodology and data collection

Chapter Three presents the methodological framework of the research, documenting in detail the theoretical foundations of the research design, the quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques applied, the analytical process, as well as ethical considerations and a reflexive interpretation of the researcher's role. The study is exploratory: it does not test hypotheses but identifies individual and collective patterns characteristic of Momentum youth, an approach closely aligned with inductive, phenomenological, and pragmatic research philosophies (Braun–Clarke 2006; Kaushik–Walsh 2019; Morgan 2014). The pragmatic framework means that methodological decisions are always adapted to the research questions and context; combining qualitative and quantitative approaches is warranted when the nature of the problem requires it. The dissertation follows an idiographic approach, placing meaning-making tied to specific life stories, experiences, and contexts at its center (Smith et al. 2009). The research process was organized in an iterative–recursive manner: fieldwork, data processing, and theoretical reflection followed one another not linearly but in feedback loops (Maxwell 2012). Drawing on the phenomenological tradition, the research examines how young people experience political socialization from their own perspective, how they construct their experiences, and how broader patterns take shape from these constructions (Flyvbjerg 2012).

Methodologically, the study follows a flexible research plan based on mixed methods. In 2017 and 2018, quantitative online surveys were conducted among Momentum's founding core and early joiners, focusing on social background, participation experiences, and political socialization mechanisms. The 2017 survey conducted within the then 142-member membership was followed in the summer of 2017 by 25 semi-structured thematic–narrative interviews; in 2018 a further online questionnaire was designed with more detailed items on socialization arenas. In 2020–2021, a quantitative survey was conducted among the membership of Momentum TizenX. The small sample sizes did not allow for multivariate statistical modeling; therefore, quantitative data are included in the dissertation as descriptive statistics supporting the qualitative analysis.

The backbone of qualitative data collection consists of semi-structured narrative–thematic interviews conducted in 2017 and then between 2021 and 2024. In total, 57 interviews were conducted with Momentum and/or TizenX members, predominantly “ordinary” Momentum youth who did not hold national, local-government, or European Parliament representative roles, nor high party leadership positions. Sampling used a multi-stage selection procedure and a screening questionnaire to ensure diversity by gender, place of residence, and educational attainment; a deliberate aim was to include a higher proportion of youth living in rural settlements. Interviews were conducted with young people aged 14–35; the majority described themselves as liberal, green, modern, and pro-European.

The 2020 pandemic marked a turning point in data collection techniques: the research adapted to the online space, and interviews were conducted via Microsoft Teams. As a consequence of online qualitative research, access expanded and the research became more democratic; it also created a safer context for discussing sensitive topics, and in many cases the online setting

increased interviewees' openness to sharing intimate, personal stories (Woodyatt et al. 2016; Davis et al. 2020). The dissertation also implemented a methodological innovation: during interviews, turning points of the socialization pathway were marked with symbols in a shared Excel file that participants could follow in real time; at the end of the conversation, the file was jointly reflected upon, and life stages were collaboratively named. This procedure supported narrative reconstruction and participant validation while also increasing the focus and data richness of online interviews. Fieldwork typically takes place in eight-week blocks, always outside election campaign periods to avoid distortions stemming from campaign logics. Scheduling followed flexible time-slot allocation aligned with participants' preferences, increasing overall willingness to participate and the quality of conversations. The interview technique combined loose narrative steering, funnel and spiral questioning, and – when necessary – confrontational probing, with continuous attention to participants' emotional safety.

Qualitative data processing took place at two levels. At the individual level, interviews were analyzed in terms of life-story logics, turning points, linguistic specificities, and contextual elements; at the collective level, recurring motifs, meaning fields, and socialization patterns were identified. Coding was an Excel-based, bottom-up, reflexive process without a pre-fixed codebook, complemented by memo writing to ensure transparency of interpretive decisions. The aim of this methodological approach is not to formulate generalizable laws, but to provide a deep, context-sensitive exploration of the political socialization pathways of Momentum Youth.

4. Research questions

The objective of the dissertation is to explore what patterns characterized the political socialization of young people entering Momentum and its youth organization across early childhood, adolescence, and the secondary-school years, and how these patterns contributed to the development of their political activity. Since the research does not aim at generalizing conclusions, the case-study nature of the phenomenon means that the goal is rather to make understandable those socialization processes that shaped the life courses of a smaller but politically active youth group. Accordingly, the dissertation's research questions focus on those socialization channels and interactions that also produced the foundations of later political involvement.

The first set of questions concerns the early phase of family socialization. The dissertation asks what kinds of political socialization influences affected Momentum youth in childhood, especially before age 14, how politics appeared in family communication, and how this contributed to the formation of primary political orientations, attitudes, and early party sympathies. The research thus aimed to explore how early political experiences structured later interest. The first research question was:

- **RQ1.** *What kinds of political socialization influences affected Momentum youth in the early childhood (pre-14) phase of socialization?*

The second set of questions focuses on the formal and informal socialization arenas of adolescence and the secondary-school years. In this context, the dissertation examines how secondary school contributes to civic and political socialization, how politics appears in classroom communication and teachers' role conceptions, and how it is present in

extracurricular school communities and deliberative culture. The aim is to understand how adolescent school experiences strengthen or weaken political interest, and what role teachers, school discourses, and peer groups play in shaping political self-concept, civic competencies, and willingness to participate. The second research question was:

- **RQ2.** *What are the specific characteristics of secondary-school, formal and informal, socialization in the process of adolescent civic and political socialization, and how does it contribute to it?*

Together, these two question blocks serve the research intention of making visible what learning processes, interactions, and socialization arenas led to the fact that the young people studied became active participants in party politics. The dissertation therefore does not seek to demonstrate the realization of a normative model of democratic political socialization; rather, it aims to understand which of the socialization mechanisms described in the literature were present, which were missing, and which organized into distinctive patterns in the life courses of Momentum youth.

5. Findings

Early childhood political socialization

The family is the first and most decisive arena of young people's political socialization; its impact is multifaceted, asymmetrical, and often ambivalent. In childhood, politics appeared primarily within the family sphere through direct interactions: parents' communication patterns, rituals linked to elections, and the dynamics of speaking about or remaining silent on politics shaped primary political interest and orientation. Based on qualitative findings, responses can be summarized in the following seven thematic points.

Primary encounters with politics

Early political memories were linked primarily to elections, campaign periods, and parents' political opinions. The first encounter with politics did not appear as a conscious learning process but as an emotionally coded experience. Young people mostly understood the categories of "us" and "them" and the basic logic of political antagonisms through family relations.

Early participation followed a so-called *ritual–civic pattern*: participation in elections became fixed as a natural, symbolic obligation and an essential pillar of civic identity.

The qualitative research identified three main patterns: *Ritual–civic socialization*, in which elections appeared as a shared family program and recurring event. Politics thus became a civic ritual, whose core was the fundamental importance of participation; and fathers' examples in particular conveyed that showing up to vote is a mandatory element of being a citizen.

Early political orientation tied to paternal patterns, in which the father served not only as a model of participation but also as an emotional reference point. Fathers were often the main initiators of the first political conversations; they shaped the categories of "us" and "them" and directly transmitted their side- and party preferences. This led to primary side-taking, which in adolescence often became a source of conflict. *An apolitical–private family model*, in which politics occasionally came up but parents' party

preferences remained hidden. Family communication in this model conveyed a double message: participating in elections is “right,” but concrete political positioning was not thematized by parents. This pattern later produced an open but cautious relationship toward (party) politics, while basic civic norms, especially the importance of participation, remained stable.

Paternal political socialization

Both interviews and quantitative results show that fathers were the primary transmitters of political knowledge, often directly passing on their party preferences and thus initiating early side-taking among youth. This pattern involved not only political orientation but also emotional attachment. Paternal socialization tended to be authoritarian and normative, which in later life stages often led to tensions, disputes, or gradual distancing from family political views. This process most commonly became pronounced in later adolescence, during a period of political skepticism.

From early childhood onward, young people received substantial civic socialization through fathers’ influence. Fathers made it explicit that one “must” deal with public affairs, that it is necessary to become informed as elections approach, and that participation is a basic civic duty. This corresponds to Campbell’s (2013) socialization principle of “a good citizen vote.” Fathers’ role-modeling (voting, political activity) played a fundamental role in shaping early political orientations. The presence of fathers in political life increased the likelihood that willingness to participate would begin to form already in childhood, in line with assumptions in literature (e.g., Plutzer 2002; Patterson–Pahlke 2021). Qualitative findings are also consistent with the observations of Szabó I. (2013), Szabó M. (2001), and Çiçek (2023): fathers appeared in childhood party-identification processes through (in)direct, but predominantly direct and often ad hoc forms of political education, producing actual adoption and imitation. The effect of fathers on party identification gradually weakened in later life stages, but the research also supports Jennings et al. (2009), who find that the significance of family effects declines gradually rather than abruptly with age.

Consistent with other studies (e.g., Neundorff–Smets 2017), fathers played a key role primarily in the formation of early political preferences. Paternal influence also manifested in the formation of basic ideological attachments, helping young people locate their family, and thus themselves, within the political map. The research thus supports the assumption of Hatemi and Ojeda (2020). Overall, it can be stated that in the development of childhood political preferences, fathers’ roles are primary; that is, strong gender specificity is observable in early political socialization.

Maternal political socialization

Maternal socialization in childhood primarily played a role in shaping values and attitudes. Mothers typically transmitted values necessary for public interest, such as empathy, autonomy, and social sensitivity. While fathers shaped the substantive side of the political field, mothers shaped its communicative and moral frame for young people. Together, but with different emphases, the two parental figures contributed to the development of Momentum youth’s political self-awareness: paternal influence appeared inside preference, maternal influence in the democratic value set.

Mothers' parenting style was characterized by indirect forms and democratic patterns based on two-way communication, confirming findings in the literature (e.g., Hively–Eveland 2008; Chaffee et al. 1972). Mothers' roles were also visible in shaping early political culture: they transmitted emotions and value convictions related to social processes. In line with Shulman and DeAndrea's (2014) assumption, it also seems true among Momentum youth that mothers applied more cautious, reflective educational forms, placing greater emphasis on explaining the social questions and changes behind political processes.

Young people often refer back to the normative system transmitted by mothers in later life stages. This may explain why many link their adult social sensitivity and empathic, inclusive attitudes to their mothers. Qualitative findings show that maternal value transmission had a prominent impact and, in several cases, also appeared as ideological model-following. This result is consistent with Gere and Stefkovics (2023), who find that ideological homophily is somewhat stronger between mother and child. A further tendency emerging from the research is that mothers entered political socialization somewhat later in time, toward the end of childhood, than fathers. Their socialization effect is nevertheless undeniable: for many young people, the core of their value set, and the resulting policy interests are what they learned from their mothers during socialization.

Discouraging effects

The research also identified “discouraging” forms of family political socialization. In several interviews, the family environment was characterized by “silence about politics”, avoidance, or trivialization. This often stemmed from deliberate conflict avoidance; in other cases, from parents' apolitical stance or distrust rooted in experiences of state socialism. This tacit distancing from politics often created a political socialization vacuum (Szabó I. 2009), which young people later filled with content in peer environments, at school, or in other public arenas. Bognár and Szabó A.'s (2017) observation – that conflict avoidance and withdrawal from political disputes are typical among Hungarian youth – also seems applicable to Momentum youths' childhood experiences.

Early party-identification processes

From the perspective of party identification, the family is a basic reference arena but not a deterministic one. Interviews identified three main patterns: (1.) *Ideological “inheritance,”* in which parental, primarily paternal, party attachment transferred directly; young people in childhood almost automatically adopted the family's side-taking and party sympathy. (2.) *Distancing,* in which during adolescence, as a result of one's own value realizations, a gradual detachment from family political views occurred. Paternal influence was particularly often subject to criticism. (3.) *Pluralized,* multi-view families, in which multiple, conflicting political orientations were present. Young people experienced political pluralism already in childhood and were forced early to navigate between competing values and narratives. The shared element of all three patterns is that the family provides the starting point of political

thinking, but political socialization proceeds as continuous reinterpretation as life stages advance.

The role of debates in childhood political socialization

While survey data suggested that the frequency of family debates is an important element of political socialization, qualitative interviews indicate that these situations rarely functioned as genuine deliberative arenas. Most debates remained emotionally charged, monologic exchanges in which parties did not listen to one another, and no shared conclusions emerged. The findings among young people align with Csizmadia (2014) and Szabó (2009): in the Hungarian society, institutionalized political education practices that could sustain democratic deliberative culture are lacking. In their absence, family politicization is not a deliberative learning arena but rather a site of emotional conflict. As children, young people were mostly passive observers, and from contentious situations they internalized conflict-avoidant patterns rather than argumentation and debate skills.

Based on interviews, three patterns can be distinguished:

- (1.) *Conflictual debates leading to tabooization*, in which intense, unresolved disputes led in the long term to the tabooing and avoidance of politics.
- (2.) *Homogeneous*, opinion-reinforcing conversations, characterized by the regular presence of politics but primarily as identity reinforcement; encounters with opposing viewpoints were rare.
- (3.) *Generational fault lines intensifying in adolescence*, in which young people's movement toward organized politics itself became a source of family conflict; the intensity of debates increased, often followed by tabooization and the dropping of political topics.

Additional findings on family socialization

Based on qualitative results, young people's family political socialization was mostly confined to the nuclear family and their immediate living environment. Political socialization in the family arena during childhood shows a conflict-avoidant, one-directional, homogeneous process (Oross–Szabó A. 2019) that changes in later life stages. In childhood, family political socialization often became “*trapped*” within the sphere of domestic publicity and remained there; accordingly, fewer other socialization actors appeared in early political education. The classic top-down effect describes these processes well in this period; at the same time, the classical stable socialization day seems less applicable to these families, as young people continuously reinterpreted socialization influences while political interaction persisted.

Early family socialization did not shape young people only emotionally; it also increased basic political knowledge. Momentum youth could distinguish political blocs, name their leading politicians, and identify the political side and actors they found sympathetic. In this respect, the research aligns with international findings suggesting that well-functioning family socialization produces higher political knowledge even before early school age (e.g., Brophy–Alleman 2005; Bigler et al. 2008).

Overall, family socialization among the young people studied can be characterized as normative but not always reflexive political learning. Parents' significance lay primarily in providing a frame and interpretive field for developing a relationship with politics, while

democratic elements of political culture—dialogue, openness, debating skills—appeared less in the early environment. The family is the first and decisive arena of young people’s political socialization, but its influence is neither uniform nor one-directional. The role of parents proved dual: in many cases they conveyed an active model, while in others they transmitted their distance from politics. Family socialization experiences provided a foundation for the development of interest but did not predetermine later entry into political life. Rather, they created a starting point and context on which later political socialization could successfully build. The family’s primary role is therefore dual: it is both a transmitter of values and norms and a socialization space that decisively contributed to shaping young people’s primary political self-awareness.

Adolescent political socialization

Timing, intensity, context

In the research I found that for Momentum and TizenX youth, the secondary-school years constitute the most saturated period of political socialization. Both quantitative and qualitative results show that after a childhood environment of politicization primarily grounded in family socialization, school and peer arenas appear more intensely in secondary school, while family influence remains present.

High school students are overrepresented and those from vocational institutions underrepresented, suggesting that most come from predominantly upper-middle-class family backgrounds in which school choice reflects parental habits and lifestyle. This also means that the picture of secondary-school political socialization primarily pertains to a high school context and builds on a family–school environment that is already more politically active. The results support Niemi and Hepburn’s (1995) observation of an adolescent “peak” in political socialization, as well as findings by Ohme et al. (2020) and Andersen et al. (2021): Momentum youth’s political interest intensifies in connection with election cycles, domestic political events (e.g.: elections, scandals), and international crises. Compared to the low and late-forming political interest typical of Hungarian youth in general (Szabó A. 2025), the studied group turns toward politics earlier and more intensively; it therefore describes a politically “over-motivated” subgroup in which adolescent socialization begins early.

According to quantitative results, different generations within Momentum come from politicized family environments: most young people experienced opinion agreement with their parents during secondary school, while the frequency of political discussions in the family was higher among TizenX members than among older Momentum members. The starting point of political interest suggests that in the memories of Momentum youth, politics is linked primarily to domestic political events and to Western electoral contexts, simultaneously reinforcing the significance of Hungarian party politics and of an international, typically Western, orientation. The research thus both supports international findings that young people’s political interest intensifies around salient events, and also nuances them: among Momentum and TizenX youth, political interest emerges early, mainly at the beginning or middle of secondary school, and is structured through dense, often conflict-laden historical–political experiences.

Teacher roles, school climate, and the family–school relationship

The research also showed that family and school in adolescent political socialization often appear not as complementary spheres but as partly independent, and at times even contradictory, socialization spaces. While the family is typically an openly politicizing environment transmitting opinions and preferences, the formal arena of school often transmits the norm of “*we do not do politics in class*,” presenting politics as dangerous, conflictual, and to be avoided. This depoliticizing strategy fits the findings of Vas (2023), Fenyő (2017), Szabó I.–Falus (2000), and research on the Eastern European region, as well as Körtvélyesi’s (2023) view of school as hierarchical and tradition-driven. According to young people’s recollections, a significant share of teachers consciously kept current politics out of classroom publicity or avoided political topics out of fear of retaliation. This may also help explain why family opinion agreement remains persistently high: the formal school arena does not counterbalance political views socialized in the family; at best it “neutralizes” them and rarely opens space for genuine opinion confrontation.

Interviews, however, also show that behind the surface of depoliticization, school is far from a politics-free space. Young people’s accounts reveal a hidden politicization in which teachers’ identifiable political orientations seep into everyday school communication through implicit and explicit signals. Students know precisely which teacher is “*hardcore Fidesz voter*,” who is “*liberal voter*,” who sympathizes with which side, and which party aligns with their values. Narratives transmitted by history and literature teachers function as elements of the hidden curriculum: even without explicit political thematization, they have serious socialization effects. In this respect, the results support the hidden curriculum literature and partially confirm Szabó Ildikó’s (2009) claim: school political education operates primarily not through declared curricular content but through interpretations imbued with affective logics.

Dynamics of formal and informal school socialization

Beyond formal classroom frames, the research also uncovered the significance of informal socialization arenas both during and beyond lessons. Young people’s recollections indicate that within schools, a small but clearly identifiable group of teachers, whom I term *internally driven democratic educators*, implemented an alternative political education practice that goes beyond the norm of depoliticization. These teachers create open, debate-oriented classroom climates, typically linked to humanities subjects, and treat students as equal conversation partners. The findings support Claes and Barber (2018) and Knowles et al. (2018): where teachers are open to students’ opinions and feedback, deliberative, argument-based political discussions are more likely to develop. The teaching style of *internally driven democratic educators* is close to the individual and critical-democratic model described by Veugelers (2017; 2021) and Leenders et al. (2008) and can be related to Holle’s (2024) critical–liberal, participation-oriented teacher type. The results suggest that these teachers’ impact is cumulative: they do not create new political interests but primarily strengthen the interest, deliberate culture, and willingness to participate of young people who arrive from politicized family environments and already possess high political capital. This aligns with Lenzi et al. (2014) and Claes et al. (2009): a

democratic, participation-oriented school climate is most effective among young people who already have some political knowledge and motivation.

The research identifies informal politicization during and beyond lessons as a distinctive, hidden, and selectively operating socialization arena. According to young people, political content often appears in the form of humor, allusions, slips of the tongue, and “*wink-wink*” cues, the decoding of which requires prior political knowledge. This means informal political socialization is not equally accessible to all: it primarily reaches those who already possess higher political capital and can recognize system critique packaged in irony and metaphors. Qualitative findings indicate that this *selective informal socialization* may contribute to reproducing socialization inequalities: students who are less informed or come from less politicized family backgrounds have a much lower chance of participating in these “*secondary publics*.” In this way, the research not only supports but also nuances Szabó I. (2006) and Csákó’s (2011) observations about the “*islands of democracy*” character of informal school arenas: these islands are not equally accessible to all students.

Extracurricular school publicity – such as corridor conversations, breaks, class trips, clubs, competition preparation – appears in young people’s memories as one of the most important but institutionally least recognized arenas of democratic education. Where teachers initiated public-affairs discussions within the school but outside formal lessons, students experienced it as emotional and intellectual reinforcement that their opinion matters, and that politics is a legitimate topic compatible with the teacher’s role. In this respect, the findings support Lenzi et al. (2014) and Claes et al. (2009) that a more horizontal school climate and teacher–student relationship positively affect willingness to participate, while also showing that these practices are not systemic but remain teacher-dependent “*islands of democracy*.”

Student councils: façade democracy and partial “schools of democracy”

Findings on student councils (DÖK) paint a differentiated picture within the studied group. Most young people report DÖK experiences that functioned more as “decorative institutions” than as genuine advocacy forums. Many describe them as outdated, low-prestige, and reduced to operational tasks, with “*no real power*” in shaping school democracy. In this respect, the research confirms Veszprémi (2017), Laki–Szabó (2014), Kalocsai–Kaposi (2019), Csákó–Sebestyén (2017), and Jakab (2020) on the “*façade democracy*” character of DÖK, teacher control, functional uncertainty, and low participation motivation. Momentum youths’ narratives especially highlight the person-dependence of DÖK: where there were “drivers,” activity temporarily intensified, but with the departure of a cohort the organization became inactive, without structural guarantees.

Qualitative results also identify a minority but politically crucial subgroup: those who held roles in well-functioning student councils supported by school leadership. These cases are closely tied to large-city and elite gymnasium contexts where principals and parts of the teaching staff treated student leaders as partners, held regular consultations, and were open to their demands. For this subgroup, DÖK functioned as a real “*school of democracy*”: it provided representation situations, negotiation practice, conflict management, and advocacy experiences. The results thus both support Jancsák (2024), Dancs–Kinyó (2015), and Oross’s (2016) assumptions about DÖK’s potential and nuance them: access to student organizations functioning as democracy practice fields is selective, tied primarily to urban, elite settings, and

for most Momentum youth it did not constitute a genuine socialization node. The dissertation therefore argues that DÖK's role is marginal for most of the studied community, but where it works, it can indeed serve as a gateway toward later political engagement.

Peer groups: complementary, reinforcing socialization

Regarding peer groups, the findings complement and partly correct peer-centered models. A significant share of Momentum youth report that during secondary school they had few peers with whom they could meaningfully discuss politics; multiple interviews record the experience of a “*peer desert*.” Politically active youth were either isolated or discussed politics in small, ideologically homogeneous, closed friendship circles. These environments, consistent with Connors (2020), Campos et al. (2017), and Hong–Lin (2017), primarily served to reinforce views brought from home; they were identity- and emotion-reinforcing spaces rather than arenas suitable for genuine opinion confrontation. Cases in which the peer group functioned as a heterogeneous, debate-oriented political arena are rarer and appear as exceptions rather than the rule. A further function of peer relations is the joint processing of public-affairs frustration, where politics appears primarily as emotional “*venting*.” Thus, the findings partly support Claes–Hooghe (2008), Hong–Lin (2017), and Campos et al. (2017) that peer influence is stronger among already politically active youth, but they contradict models (e.g., Quintelier 2015) that posit peer groups as an overarching primary socialization field ahead of school and family. Among Momentum youth, peers overwhelmingly play a complementary, reinforcing role in the shadow of family and school.

Lack of coherence and the coexistence of socialization arenas

A key finding regarding the linkage of socialization arenas is that no coherent, cumulative, integrated model of political socialization emerges. Instead, what appears is a fragmented, coexisting field with partly contradictory logics, in which family, the formal arena of school, informal school spaces, student councils, and peer groups contribute in different ways and with different intensities to adolescent political learning. This picture resembles diagnoses by Szabó I. (2009), Bognár–Szabó A. (2017), and others regarding the simultaneous presence of state-socialist legacies, semi-peripheral features, and democratic elements. While for Momentum youth the family is a politicizing and orienting, the formal arena of school often builds on rejecting and tabooing politics; at the same time, informal school spaces and well-functioning student councils create “*democratic islands*.” Peer groups in this system function more as emotional reinforcers than as structuring actors. Overall, results show that Momentum and TizenX youth enter organized politics from a socialization environment in which, despite a lack of coherence, high political interest, relatively developed deliberate culture, and strong willingness to participate can still emerge. The novelty of the research is that it demonstrates: for these young people, political activism is not produced by a single unified model of democratic education, but by the combined, often hidden and selective effects of multiple, sometimes contradictory, socialization impulses.

6. Conclusions and limitations of the dissertation

The dissertation begins that Hungarian youth show persistently low levels of interest and willingness to participate, while joining formal political institutions is rare and restricted to narrow groups. Young members of Momentum and its youth organization, TizenX, belong to this statistically “vanishing” minority: they form a political micro-community that contradicts the claim of passivity. From this perspective, the dissertation reveals the socialization of a previously hidden political community: young people who grew up already in the post-transition democratic era, about whom Hungarian empirical research previously lacked information regarding background, motivations to join, or socialization context. The dissertation shows how this political generation is built from family, school, and peer experiences, and from what, partly democratic, partly semi-peripheral, socialization fields they enter the world of organized politics.

Methodologically, the research combines tools from sociology and applied opinion research: the combination of three survey waves and several dozen in-depth interviews made it possible to interpret political socialization not only through attitudes and frequencies but also along individual narrative logics. The mixed-method approach offers added value precisely where exclusively survey-based or exclusively qualitative studies reach limits: it makes visible the fragmented yet at certain points converging socialization network through which young people’s political interest emerges and persists. In doing so, the dissertation both enriches Hungarian and international political socialization scholarship with new empirical material and offers a methodological template for reaching and describing hard-to-access political groups.

One central finding is that the dissertation provides a detailed account of the age dynamics of political interest. Among Momentum youth, political interest starts earlier than studies of Hungarian youth in general suggest active news consumption, following elections, and interpreting party differences appear already in the early or middle years of secondary school. The decisive source of this early interest is the family: most of the sample comes from environments where politics is an integral part of everyday conversation and where parents (semi-)consciously engage in civic education. At the same time, the results also confirm domestic theories of political socialization: in a semi-peripheral, fragmented socialization context, family, school, and peer arenas only partially fit together and often follow opposing logics, yet they can still generate a mix that later leads to active political participation.

The analysis of the family arena shows that the decisive majority of young people grew up in households where politics is not taboo but an “*default*” topic. The childhood learning process is top-down: children initially participate in political disputes as listeners and observers, and party preferences and ideological orientations initially follow parental patterns. Fathers are typically the main reference points of early party identification and side-taking, while mothers’ roles are more significant in dimensions related to social sensitivity and the value set. How political conflict is handled, how fairness-related arguments are formed, and how empathy develops are shaped in these family patterns in differentiated but clearly visible ways. The homogeneous, relatively conflict-avoidant family arena loosens in adolescence: this is when generational disputes and partial distancing from parents appear – without a radical collapse of basic value agreement. In this way, the dissertation confirms the thesis in the Hungarian

literature that the family remains the primary arena of political socialization, but in adolescence it is no longer exclusive; it becomes an arena competing with additional fields.

In secondary school, more actors indeed enter the arena of political socialization, but not as a coherent democratic model; rather as practices placed next to one another that partly follow opposing logics. The appearance of internally driven democratic educators is key research finding: these teachers consciously create open, debate-based classroom climates, bring current public-affairs topics into lessons, and treat students as partners. According to young people's accounts, such educators transmit not only knowledge but also argumentative strategies, conflict-management patterns, and democratic norms. The findings support socialization research (Veugelers 2017; 2021; Holle 2024) that a democratic, participation-oriented school climate positively affects political interest and willingness to participate – while also showing empirically that this practice is not institutionalized but depends on the individual commitment of a few “drivers.” In this sense, the dissertation aligns with Csizmadia (2014) and others in showing that Hungary lacks a stable school tradition of democratic education: democratic pedagogy exists as islands of democracy rather than as a systemic practice.

Looking at the formal school arena as a whole, depoliticization and conscious distancing from politics dominate. Most teachers avoid current political debates; politics often appears as forbidden, dangerous, and banished beyond school walls. From this perspective, the dissertation confirms empirical results documenting deficiencies in political education and the dominance of the “*we do not discuss politics at school*” norm. The interviews also indicate, however, that politics is very much present at the level of the hidden curriculum. Young people precisely decode their teachers' political orientations, and identifiable narratives emerge ranging from national-conservative (sometimes nationalist) interpretations of history to system-critical, anti-government irony. The dissertation thus nuances the image of the depoliticized school: it shows that political socialization takes place not in curricula, but in gestures, half-sentences, silences, and affective imprints-simultaneously.

The informal school arena, such as breaks, corridor conversations, clubs, competition preparation, trips, is among the most important yet most “*hidden*” arenas of democratic education for the young people studied. Internally driven democratic educators often express their stance more openly in these contexts, jointly interpret current issues, and provide strong emotional reinforcement to young people who already have a politicized orientation. According to the research, political socialization here is selective: it reaches only those who have the necessary motivation and political capital to take part. In this way, the dissertation both supports the “*islands of democracy*” concept and shows that these islands may reinforce rather than reduce political socialization inequalities.

Findings regarding student councils paint a mixed but clearly structured picture. Most young people describe DÖK as an emptied, low-prestige institution narrowed to operational tasks – at most organizing events, with little impact on school decision-making. These narratives directly confirm the Hungarian literature's “*fake democracy*” interpretation. At the same time, the dissertation identifies a smaller but politically crucial subgroup socialized in well-functioning, leadership-supported student councils in large-city or elite gymnasium contexts. For them, DÖK is a real “*school of democracy*”: an arena of representation, negotiation

practice, and collective advocacy. These positive experiences are selective, strongly socially filtered, and far from generalizable to most young people.

Peer groups in the studied political community typically function as complementary, reinforcing arenas of socialization. The research shows that many Momentums youth do not find politically active peers at all – or if they do, discussions take place in homogeneous, closed friendship circles. These settings serve more to amplify narratives brought from home and to vent collectively than to provide new information and viewpoints. Truly plural, debate-oriented peer politicization is rare and appears an exception. Thus, the findings partly confirm international results emphasizing the role of group homogeneity and opinion congruence, but they question models that treat peer groups as a primary socialization field stronger than family and school. Among Momentum youth, peers' role is more about emotional reinforcement and identity clarification; the foundations of political orientation are provided by family and certain school actors.

The dissertation's overall conclusion is that the various socialization arenas in the life courses of politically active Momentum youth do not merge into a coherent democratic pattern. Family, the formal and informal arenas of school, student councils, and peer groups follow separate and often contradictory logics; political socialization is organized more along configurations than along clearly delineated, linear "*paths*." Democratic political socialization is realized only partially: in fragments, in islands of democracy, in the practices of internally driven democratic educators, in well-functioning student councils, and in certain peer environments. Yet these fragments, combined with family politicization, prove sufficient for a substantial share of young people to turn toward organized politics, join a party and youth organization, and seek a field of action within a political community. The research thus both reinforces the literature's diagnosis of semi-peripheral, fragmented socialization and shows that within this environment it is still possible to develop democratic attitudes and reflexive civic conduct – not through a coherent model, but through socialization patterns that often meet in unexpected ways.

The dissertation also emphasizes its own limitations. The studied political community is more socially privileged than most Hungarian youth; Momentum youths' political thinking and self-reflection are likely more coherent and articulate than those of other groups. Moreover, political socialization processes among the young people studied have not yet concluded; the dissertation provides a snapshot of a generation whose political careers, organizational attachments, and identities may continue to change. The research focuses on a single political community, does not include the "sender side" of socialization (parents, teachers, peers), and conceptualizes the "*democratic political socialization*" model primarily on the basis of Western European and North American norms, while Hungarian democratic education is closer to a semi-peripheral socialization model. In addition, the size of the quantitative samples and the retrospective narrative mode limit generalizability and the possibility of model building.

Despite this, the dissertation offers a clear outlook: it highlights that the points for strengthening democratic political culture are already present in everyday practices. Family conversations, debates occurring within the school space, the practices of internally driven democratic educators, and the emotional solidarity of peer environments are all socialization nodes capable, in the long run, of grounding civic competencies and reflexive political thinking.

The stories of Momentum youth suggest that democratic political socialization does not depend exclusively on institutional reforms, new curricula, or programs. It also depends on how we speak about politics at home, what we allow in the classroom, and what spaces we open for young people to argue, debate, and participate. Based on this generation's experiences, a more democratic future appears not as an abstract goal but as an already ongoing, fragmented process – the question is whether society's institutions and actors will be able to connect these scattered islands of democracy into something more integrated.

7. References

- Almond, G. – Verba, S. (1963): *The Civic Culture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton. (ISBN 978-0691021446).
- Andersen, K. – Ohme, J. – Bjarnøe, C. – Bordacconi M., J. – Albæk, E. – de Vreese C. (2021): *Generational Gaps in Political Media Use and Civic Engagement From Baby Boomers to Generation Z*. First published 202 by Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon. (ISBN: 978-1-003-11149-8).
- Bauer, Béla – Pillók, Péter – Ruff, Tamás – Szabó, Andrea – Szanyi, F. Eleonóra – Székely, Levente (2017): *Közösség és politika*. In: Székely Levente–Szabó Andrea (szerk.) *Magyar Ifjúság Kutatás 2016. Az ifjúságkutatás első eredményei. Ezek a mai magyar fiatalok!* Budapest: Új Nemzedék Központ, p. 66–84. (ISBN 978-963-89917-8-8).
- Bíró-Nagy, András – Szabó, Andrea (2021): *Magyar fiatalok 2021. Elégedetlenség, polarizáció, EU-pártiság*. Budapest: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. (ISBN 978-615-80252-8-3).
- Bigler, R. S. – Arthur, A. E. – Hughes, J. M. – Patterson, M. M. (2008): The politics of race and gender: Children's perceptions of discrimination and the U.S. presidency. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP)*, 8(1), p. 83–112. DOI: 10.1111/J.1530-2415.2008.00161.x
- Bognár, Adrienn – Szabó, Andrea (2017): *Politikai szocializáció modellek Magyarországon, 1990–2016*. In: Szabó Andrea – Oross Dániel (szerk.): *Csendesek vagy lázadók? – A hallgatók politikai orientációi Magyarországon (2011–2015)*. Szeged–Budapest: Belvedere Meridionale és MTA TK PTI, p. 14–34. (ISBN: 978-615-5372-52-1).
- Braun, V. – Clarke, V. (2006): Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), p. 77–101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brophy, J. – Alleman, J. (2006): *Children's thinking about cultural universals*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410615619>
- Campbell, D. E. (2013): Social Networks and Political Participation. *Annual Review of Political Science*. Volume 16, p. 33–48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033011-201728>
- Campos, C. – Hargreaves H., S. – Leon, F. (2017): The political influence of peer groups: Experimental evidence in the classroom. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 69(4), p. 963–985. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oeq/gpw065>
- Çiçek, A. (2023): A Field Study on Political Socialization of Political Science Students. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 24(3), p. 431–443. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37880/cumuiibf.1286842>
- Chaffee, S. H. – McLeod, J. M. – Wackman, D. B. (1973): Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. In: Dennis, J. (Ed.): *Socialization to politics: A reader*. New York: John Wiley, p. 349–364. (ISBN 978-0471206109).
- Connors, E. (2020): The social dimension of political values. *Political Behavior*, 42, p. 961–982. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09530-3>
- Csizmadia, Ervin (2014): *Miért „alaptalan” a magyar demokrácia? Pártok, konfliktusok, társadalmi kohézió és állampolgári nevelés*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó. (ISBN 978-963-693-575-0).
- Csákó, Mihály (2017): A magyar politikaszocializáció-kutatás történetének vázlatja. *Magyar tudomány*, 178(9), p. 1065–1071.
- Davies, L. – LeClair, K. L. – Bagley, P. – Blunt, H. – Hinton, L. R. S. – Ziebland, S. (2020): Face-to-face compared with online collected accounts of health and illness experiences: A scoping review. *Qualitative Health Research*, 30(13), p. 2092–2102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732320935835>
- Flyvbjerg, Bent (2012): *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810503>
- Gere, Dömötör – Stefkovics, Ádám (2023): A vasárnapi ebédetől a szavazóurnáig. Politikai szocializáció és politikai homofília a magyar társadalomban. *Metszetek*, 12(2), p. 8–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18392/metsz/2023/2/2>

- Jenkins, H. – Ito, M. – Boyd, D. (2016): *Participatory Culture in a Networked Era: A Conversation on Youth, Learning, Commerce, and Politics*. Polity Press. Forrás: <https://tinyurl.com/s58sx757>, utolsó letöltés: 2025.11.24.
- Jennings, M. K. – Stoker, L. – Bowers, J. (2009): Politics across generations: family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3), p. 782–799. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381609090719>
- Hatemi, P.K. – Ojeda, C. (2020): The role of child perception and motivation in political socialization. *British Journal of Political Science*, 51(3), p. 1097–1118. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123419000516>
- Hess, R. – Torney, J. (1967): *The development of political attitudes in children*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company. (ISBN 978-0202308712).
- Hively, M. H. – Eveland, W. P. (2009): Contextual antecedents and political consequences of adolescent political discussion, discussion elaboration, and network diversity. *Political Communication*, 26(1), p. 30–47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600802622837>
- Holle, Alexandra (2024): *Az állampolgári nevelés nyomában – Elméletek, politikai szándékok és elitgimnáziumi perspektívák*. Doktori (PhD) értekezés, Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Nemzetközi Kapcsolatok és Politikatudományi Doktori Iskola. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14267/phd.2024031> 7–33. DOI: 10.30718/POLTUD.HU.2022.3.7
- Hong, Y. – Lin, T. (2017): The Impacts of Political Socialization on People’s Online and Offline Political Participation—Taking the Youth of Singapore as an Example. *Advances in Journalism and Communication*, 5(1), p. 50–70. DOI: [10.4236/ajc.2017.51003](https://doi.org/10.4236/ajc.2017.51003)
- Hooghe, M. – Stiers, D. (2020): Political discussion begins at home. Household dynamics following the enfranchisement of adolescent children. *Applied Developmental Science*, 26(1), p. 141–154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2020.1712207>
- Kahne, J. – Bowyer, B. (2018): The Political Significance of Social Media Activity and Social Networks. *Political Communication*, 35(3), p. 470–493. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662
- Kaushik, V. – Walsh, C. A. (2019): Pragmatism as a Research Paradigm and Its Implications for Social Work Research. *Social Sciences*, 8(9), p. 255. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8090255>
- Kéri, László (1989): *Politikai folyamatok szocializációs metszetben*. Budapest: MSZMP KB Társadalomtudományi Intézete. (ISBN 963-7182-53-5).
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012): *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. (ISBN 978-1412981194).
- Morgan, D. (2014): Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(8), p. 1045–1053. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413513733>
- Neundorff, Anja – Smets, Kaat (2017): *Political Socialization and the Making of Citizens*. Oxford Handbooks Online. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935307.013.98>
- Niemi, R. G. – Hepburn, M. A. (1995): The Rebirth of Political Socialization. *Perspectives on Political Science*, 24(1), p. 7–16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10457097.1995.9941860>
- Ohme, J. – Marquart, F. – Kristensen, L. M. (2020): School lessons, social media, and political events in a get-out-the-vote campaign: successful drivers of political engagement among youth? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 23(7), p. 886–908. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2019.1645311>
- Oross, Dániel – Szabó, Andrea (2019): *A politika és a magyar fiatalok*. Budapest: Noran Libro Kft. Meridionale. (ISBN 978-963-446-554-1).
- Patterson, M. – Pahlke, E. (2021): The elephant (and donkey) in the room: Parents’ approaches to political socialization surrounding the 2020 US election. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 21(1), p. 121–148. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12260>
- Percheron, A. (1999): Durkheim és a kultúra antropológia öröksége. In: Szabó Ildikó–Csákó Mihály (szerk.) *A politikai szocializáció. Válogatás a francia nyelvterület szakirodalmából*. Budapest: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó, p. 44–57. (ISBN 963-915-807-0).
- Plutzer, E. (2002): Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), p. 41–56. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055402004227>
- Quintelier, E. (2015): Engaging adolescents in politics: The longitudinal effect of political socialization agents. *Youth & Society*, 47(1), p. 51–69. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13507295>
- Searing, D. D. – Schwartz, J. J. – Lind, A. E. (1973): The Structuring Principle: Political Socialization and Belief Systems. *American Political Science Review*, 67(2), p. 415–432. DOI: [10.2307/1958774](https://doi.org/10.2307/1958774)
- Shulman, Hillary C. – DeAndrea, David C. (2014): Predicting Success: Revisiting Assumptions About Family Political Socialization. *Communication Monographs*, 81(3), p. 386–406, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2014.936478>
- Smith, Jonathan – Flowers, Paul – Larkin, Michael (2009): *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. (ISBN 9781412908344).
- Szabó, Andrea (2025): *Mintakövetés és/vagy önálló vélemény? A politikai érdeklődés tendenciái Magyarországon*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó. (ISBN 978-963-556-616-7).

- Szabó, Miklós (2001): A politikai szocializáció. In: Kéri László (szerk.): *Societas Politica – fejezetek a politikai szociológia köréből*. Miskolc: Bíbor Kiadó, p. 245–266. (ISBN 963-9068-99-X).
- Szabó, Ildikó (1991): *Az ember államosítása: politikai szocializáció Magyarországon*. Budapest: Tekintet Alapítvány. (ISBN 963-00-1589-X).
- Szabó, Ildikó (2009): *A nemzet és a szocializáció. A politika szerepe az identitások formálódásában Magyarországon 1867–2006*. Budapest: L'Harmattan Kiadó. (ISBN 978-963-236-152-8).
- Theocharis, Y. (2015): The Conceptualization of Digitally Networked Participation. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2), p. 1–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610140>
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002): The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), p. 203–212. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0604_7
- Tóth, András (2018): A Momentum és Magyarország választásai. In: *Mozgalmi társadalom*. Noran Libro Kiadó, Budapest, p. 243–278. (ISBN 978-615-57-6150-8).
- Vaccari, C. – Valeriani, A. – Barberá, P. – Jost, J. T. – Nagler, J. – Tucker, J. (2015): Political Expression and Action on Social Media: Exploring the Relationship Between Lower- and Higher-Threshold Political Activities Among Twitter Users in Italy. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 20(2), p. 221–239. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12108>
- Veugelers, W. (2017): Education for Critical-Democratic Citizenship. In: Aloni, N., & Weintrob, L. (Eds.): *Beyond Bystanders. Moral Development and Citizenship Education*, p. 47–59. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-026-4_4
- Veugelers, W. (2021): A Moral Perspective on Citizenship Education and on IEA's International Civic and Citizenship Education Studies. In: Malak-Minkiewicz, B. – Torney-Purta, J. (eds): *Influences of the IEA Civic and Citizenship Education Studies*. Springer, Cham. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71102-3_24
- Wineburg, S. – McGrew, S. – Breakstone, J. – Ortega, T. (2016): *Evaluating Information: The Cornerstone of Civic Online Reasoning*. Stanford University, CA. Stanford Digital Repository. Forrás: <https://tinyurl.com/43mhdf7r>, utolsó letöltés: 2025.09.22.
- Wong, J. – Tseng, V. (2008): Political socialization in immigrant families: Challenging top-down parental socialization models. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(1), p. 151–168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830701708742>
- Woodyatt, C. R. – Finneran, C. A. – Stephenson, R. (2016): In-Person Versus Online Focus Group Discussions: A Comparative Analysis of Data Quality. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(6), p. 741–749. DOI: 10.1177/1049732316631510
- York, C. (2019): Is it top-down, trickle-up, or reciprocal? Testing longitudinal relationships between youth news use and parent and peer political discussion. *Communication Studies*, 70(4), p. 377–393. DOI: [10.1080/10510974.2019.1614965](https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2019.1614965)