

University Students' Democratic Values and Attitudes toward Democracy in Hungary

Oross, Daniel; Kovacs, Tamas; Szabo, Andrea

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Oross, D., Kovacs, T., & Szabo, A. (2018). University Students' Democratic Values and Attitudes toward Democracy in Hungary. *European Quarterly of Political Attitudes and Mentalities*, 7(1), 15-31. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-55675-2>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

University Students' Democratic Values and Attitudes towards Democracy in Hungary

Oross Dániel, Kovács Tamás and Andrea Szabó
Hungarian Academy of Sciences Centre for Social Sciences
Budapest, Hungary

Date of submission: November 25th, 2017

Date of acceptance: January 23rd, 2018

Abstract

In December 2012 Hungarian students rallied to protest against cutbacks in scholarships and to the introduction of tuition fees. Two years later, in October 2014, thousands of (mostly young) people gathered at anti-government demonstrations against a proposal to include the taxation of Internet usage in the Taxation Law. The article brings results on changes in patterns of democratic citizenship among Hungarian students and demonstrates that despite their issue related 'rational rebellion' democratic transition resulted in a low-level of political participation and commitment to democratic values among them. We describe democratic attitudes of Hungarian college and university students by using both qualitative and quantitative data asking if they have developed a commitment to democracy as a system of rule.

Keywords: citizenship, democratic attitudes, political participation, higher education



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

University students have played an important role in revolutionary changes throughout Hungarian history (1848, 1956). Members of this age cohort are embedded both in the traditional values of their families and in the new ideas of youth organizations, and are therefore very sensitive to societal changes. Although sit-

Corresponding Author: Dr. Oross Dániel, Junior Research Fellow

Affiliation: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Social Sciences, Institute for Political Science

Address: H-1097 Budapest, Tóth Kálmán u. 4.

e-mail: oross.daniel@k.mta.hu

Copyright © 2018, Oross Dániel, Kovács Tamás and Andrea Szabó

European Quarterly of Political Attitudes and Mentalities - EQPAM, Volume 7, No.1, January 2018, pp.15-31.

ISSN 2285 – 4916
ISSN-L 2285 – 4916

ins at universities are quite a current phenomenon in Western societies, and there have been organized such actions also in East-Central Europe (e.g. in 2009 in Vienna¹ or in Zagreb²), this form of direct action has happened first time in Hungary in 2012. Students protested against the Hungarian Government's planned cuts in the state subsidies to finance college tuition in Budapest on 10 December 2012. After a sit-in at Eötvös Loránd University's (that is the biggest university in Hungary) lecture hall more than 1 000 students rallied, blocking bridges over the Danube in freezing weather, and marched to Parliament. The protest later became a nationwide movement and students organized similar actions in different Hungarian cities over the course of several week. Two years later, in late October 2014, anti-government demonstrations were held in Hungary, which were triggered by the government's announcement of a proposal to include the taxation of Internet usage in the Taxation Law. On 26th of October thousands of (mostly young) people gathered. On 28th similar events took place in multiple cities in Hungary. Reuters estimated the number of people approximately 100,000 at the second demonstration. These events (2012, 2014) can be considered as 'rebellion', a point at which the lurking deep dissatisfaction breaks up. Since our data covers a period between 2011 and 2015 our analysis can bring interesting new results on changes in patterns of democratic citizenship in Hungary.

Analyzing university student's attitudes is relevant because among social institutions universities are one of the most important socialization agents for democratic education. As well as serving the interests of individuals, the higher education also accomplishes community goals in contemporary societies. Many scholars argue that universities have a civic mission to serve public good and to create democratic citizens (Barnett 2007, Ehrlich 2000, Biesta 2009). It is also mentioned that university is a civic mission itself (Barber 1991). According to Shapiro (2005), the fundamental requirement of university education is creating democratic citizens and Nussbaum also talks (2002) about the necessary representation of deliberative democratic citizenship in higher education. Galston (2001) has argued that student's participation in university community may increase their chance to become politically engaged and to acquire basics skills to serve public good. These arguments suggest that universities play an important role in democratic citizenship education and the training of citizens inside the university has also an impact on democracy outside the university.

Hungary was the first country in the East Central European region that succeeded in building and stabilizing democratic institutions following the collapse of communism in 1989/1990. We build on the literature about the empirical and theoretical framework of measuring democratic attitudes to answer the question if 25 years after the collapse of communism we can witness the emergence of a new generation of active Hungarian democrats? Has this period allowed for forging a coherent vision of democracy, accepting and interiorizing democratic values and commitments? Or instead, does the Hungarian case underline Orit Ichilov's statement that he wrote in 1990: even if a generation grows up and matures in a democratic system, this does not guarantee that a democratic political culture will take root in society (Ichilov 1990:11-20)? Based on the empirical framework, the study shows empirical results on democratic commitment among Hungarian students.

¹A sit-in at Vienna University's lecture hall has inspired thousands of other students all over the country to demand the government ploughs more money into the education system <http://www.euronews.com/2009/10/29/austria-s-students-demand-reforms>

²On 20 April 2009, the independent students' initiative for the right to free education started an occupation of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, Croatia. The occupation lasted for 35 days <http://arhiva.dalje.com/en-croatia/faculty-bloc-lifted-34-days-later/260322>

2. Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy among Young People

There are many studies which have created their own conceptualization and measuring processes for citizenship current debates about conceptualizing and measuring democracy (Coppedge and Gerring 2011). In the following chapter, we try to describe the most important results of these attempts from the perspective of young people.

Table 2-1. Conceptions of Democracy

Source: Coppedge and Gerring, 2011:254

	Principles	Institutions	Question
I. Electoral (elite, minimal, realist, Schumpeterian)	Contestation, competition	Elections, political parties, competitiveness and turnover	Are government offices filled by free and fair multiparty elections?
II. Liberal (consensus, pluralist)	Limited government, multiple veto points, horizontal accountability, individual rights, civil liberties, transparency	Multiple, independent, and decentralized, with special focus on the role of the media, interest groups, the judiciary, and a written constitution with explicit guarantees	Is political power decentralized & constrained?
III. Majoritarian (responsible party government)	Majority rule, centralization, vertical accountability	Consolidated and centralized, with special focus on the role of political parties	Does the majority (or plurality) rule?
IV. Participatory	Government by the people	Election law, civil society, local government, direct democracy	Do ordinary citizens participate in politics?
V. Deliberative	Government by reason	Media, hearings, panels, other deliberative bodies	Are political decisions the product of public deliberation?
VI. Egalitarian	Political equality	Designed to ensure equal participation, representation, protection, and politically relevant resources	Are all citizens equally empowered?

There is no consensus on what democracy at large means. After surveying the literature, Coppedge and Gerring defined six key models: electoral, liberal, majoritarian, participatory, deliberative, and egalitarian (see Table 1). These conceptions taken together offer a fairly comprehensive accounting of the concept of democracy as it is employed today.

Norman H. Nie, Jane Junn, and Kenneth Stehlik-Barry (1996) have argued that democratic education is the key element for creating active citizens. Proving this statement, they conceptualized the main dimensions of democratic citizenship. Authors have identified two elements which are the most important components of it: political engagement and democratic enlightenment. The political engagement means the capability of citizens to engage in self-rule and pursue their interests. Democratic enlightenment signifies the understanding and acceptance of democratic rules by the citizens (11 pp). The first dimension

of democratic citizenship (*political engagement*) includes elements of knowledge about political leaders and the participation in political activities. The second dimension involves knowledge of democratic principles and tolerance. There are several factors which belong to both dimensions. The knowledge of current political facts, political attentiveness and the procedure of voting are common elements of the two separated theoretical dimensions.

According to B. Hoskins and M. Mascherini (2006), there are different dimensions of active citizenship. Authors have constructed a composite indicator and they have used ESS data from 2002. The structure of their composite indicator builds on four different dimensions: Political Life, Civil Society, Community and Values. The four dimensions include all in all 63 basic indicators with different scales. The dimension of Political Life includes data about party membership, volunteering, participating in party activities and donating money. It refers to the conventional representative democracy and it involves 9 different factors. The dimension of Civil Society focuses to political non-governmental action such as different kind of protests activities and participation in non-governmental organizations. The Community Life describes such factors which are less overtly political and more oriented towards the community. The dimension includes 25 different indicators which refer the participation in religious, business, sports, cultural and social organizations. The dimension of Values includes elements about democracy and human rights. Authors have added to this dimension the factor of intercultural understanding also which reflect on the cultural diversification.

The IEA CIVED Study³ (Jo-Ann Amadeo et al. 2001) measured civic engagement and knowledge of 14-year-old students. For this, authors have developed measuring instruments and they intended to know what democracy means to students. The research topic had three sub-domains: democracy and its defining characteristics; institutions and practices in democracy; citizenship—rights and duties. During the conceptualization, the researchers have organized the 267 items into 14 different categories. 'Democracy and its defining characteristics' category includes the interpretation about characteristics of democracy and how identify the students the border between democratic and non-democratic government. Furthermore, this category also analyzes what students think about the transition from non-democratic to democratic political system. The category of institutions and practices in democracy involves questions about the characteristic and functions of elections and parties, the qualifications of candidates and the basic character of parliament, judicial system, law and police. The sub-domain category of citizenship-rights and duties analyze how students identify the citizens' general rights, qualifications and obligations in democracy. It also tests how respondents understand the role of mass media and the citizen's rights in the economic sphere.

3. The Hungarian Case from a Comparative Perspective


In order to have a general overview on students relationship to democracy in Europe, we have chosen the question '*How important is for you to live in a democratically governed country*' from the most recent dataset (2012) of the European Social Survey⁴. **Figure 3-1** and **Figure 3-2** shows those respondents who have reported that they take part in the education system as students.

According to these data Swiss and Danish students are the most satisfied with the way how democracy works in their country and for them it is important that their country is democratically governed.

³28 countries have participated in this research project between 1997 and 1998.

⁴ The European Social Survey (ESS) is an academically driven cross-national survey that has been conducted across Europe since 2001. Every two years, face-to-face interviews are conducted with newly selected, cross-sectional samples.

Students in Cyprus are not satisfied with their country's democratic government however they consider a country to be democratically governed as something very important. Similarly to Slovak, Polish, Lithuanian, Portuguese students, Hungarians find that their country is not very democratic but for them it is not a very important issue. Data clearly indicate the separation and the relative similarity of 4 groups of European countries.



Source: ESS 6.2.

Figure 3-1.

How important for you to live in democratically governed country by How democratic your country is overall – studied in the last 7 days and the highest level of education is secondary school (means, 0–10)

It is worth considering the gap⁵ between the importance of a country to be democratically governed, and how democratic that country is (Figure 3-2). Those countries where there is a low level of difference between the expectations towards the democratic system and the way how democracy works can be found in the left corner (Swiss, Danish Czech students) with low values, whereas those countries where the gap is high are in the right corner (Albania, Bulgaria, Cyprus). Hungarian students can be found in the first third of the sample that indicates quite a high gap meaning that it is quite important for students their country to be democratically governed but what they experience as reality does not fit to their expectations.

⁵This is an index created by the mean of the question 'How important for you to live in democratically governed country' (0–10) and the mean of question 'How democratic [country] is overall' (0–10). We have deducted the number of the second question from the first and have taken the mean of the result. If the means value is 0 there is no gap between the importance and the reality of democracy.




Figure 3-2. Democratic gap (index)

(Gap between the importance of democracy and the real democratic governance)*
– studied in the last 7 days and the highest level of education is secondary school

Method:

How important for you to live in democratically governed country (0–10) - How democratic [country] is overall (0–10). 0 mean= there is no gap between the importance and the reality of democracy.

Democratic participation as a missing link? Patterns of democratic citizenship among Hungarian university students

The basic limitation of measuring's democratic commitment is the way of understanding democratic normative values. The concept of democracy has always been a subject of the debates (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996). From this aspect, it is a legitimate question what kinds of interpretations exist about the concept of democracy among Hungarian university students? Answering this question, we also analyze qualitative data to demonstrate students' perception about the democracy. Therefore, the empirical results rely on the students' interpretation about democracy.

In an earlier article (Szabó, 2015) we analysed Hungarian university students' concept about democracy. Results have shown that the students' view about democracy is very fragmented. We could distinguish 5 different interpretations among university students: the egalitarian approach of democracy, the majoritarian approach, the electoral approach, the deliberative approach and the liberal approach. It's quite interesting that the collection of students' interpretation is very similar to Coppedge and Gerring's (2011) conception about democracy.

Based on students' answers the egalitarian interpretation of democracy emphasizes the relevance of equality before law in theory and practice. Based on students interpretations, the democracy is 'a system where there is equality, namely, equality before the law', and 'everyone has equal rights'.

Furthermore, the respondents usually said that the main trait of democracy are the 'equality and the maintenance of law and order'. These statements emphasize the legal aspect of democracy but also show the social aspect as well.

The majoritarian approach suggests that democracy is none other than the rule of majority. The students argue that there is democracy where 'the goals of a community are defined based on what the majority of the community would like'. Based on respondents' answers, in every democratic order 'should prevail the will of the majority of the people'. This interpretation approaches to democracy from the insight of decision-making.

Table 3-2. Student answers that are characteristic of different interpretations
(What does democracy mean to you?)

Egalitarian	Majoritarian	Electoral	Deliberative	Liberal
'A system where there is equality, namely, equality before the law'	'The will of the people prevails, their freedom is secured'	'People elect the politicians, who have to keep in mind the interests of the people'	'Everyone has an opinion and everyone's opinion counts'	'A system where every person has the possibility to attain their personal freedom'
'Everyone has equal rights'	'The goals of a community are defined based on what the majority of the community would like'	'When people can choose their own leaders and they can enforce their will through them'	'Everyone has a say in which way the country should go and what aspects should prevail'	'Democracy means I can shape my fate and I am responsible for it'
'Equality and the maintenance of law and order'	'The will of the majority of the people should prevail'	'When people can choose their own leaders and they can enforce their will through them'	'Everyone has a say in the final decision'	'When someone has free will and basically acts according to their own intentions in accordance with certain rules'

Source: Szabó, A. (2015:37)

According to the electoral approach, the democracy is cooperation between the people and their representatives, elected political leaders. The respondents emphasized that in democracy 'people elect the politicians, who have to keep in mind the interests of the people'. With other words, 'the people choose a person who conveys and carries out their will'. Based on these interpretations, that is democracy 'when people can choose their own leaders and they can enforce their will through them'. This approach suggests that democracy is a system of representation.

The deliberative approach defines the meaning of democracy as the ability to voice opinion in the political decision-making process in equal measure. In democracy, every citizen has a say in public affairs, 'everyone has an opinion and everyone's opinion counts'. Students suggest that 'everyone can influence in which way the country should go and what aspects should prevail'.

According to the liberal approach, democracy is a 'system where every person has the possibility to attain their personal freedom'. Respondents emphasize the relevance of free will and responsibility in democratic order. Based on students' answers, democracy is 'when someone has free will and basically acts according to their own intentions in accordance with certain rules'. This interpretation approaches to democracy from the aspect of individuality.

From the aspect of Coppedge and Gerring's (2011) conceptions, one is missing from Hungarian students' interpretations. Respondents didn't emphasize the participatory elements of democracy in their answers. With other words, the participatory concept of democracy is not a characteristic element of student's vision about Hungarian democracy. This result contradicts with the phenomena what we mentioned in the introduction. If the students have participated in those protests between 2012 and 2014, the lack of participatory concept from their interpretations is inconsistent. To clarify this contradiction, we conceptualize and measure the democratic attitudes of Hungarian university students related to political participation.

4. Hypotheses and Research Questions

According to Orit Ichilov, the most important goal of political socialization in democracies is to prepare society for civic engagement and active participation in politics. However, more than 25 after the democratic transition participatory elements of democracy are missing from the interpretations of Hungarian students about democracy.

We aim to find out how political participation is related to Hungarian university students' attitudes towards democracy. We assume that participative elements of democratic culture do not appear among a great part of Hungarian students' attitudes. But based on the political events that happened in 2012 and in 2014 we expect that political participation is a constitutive element for some groups of Hungarian students' collective consciousness.

5. Data and Methods

In the paper, we employ data collected by Active Youth in Hungary Research Round 1–3.⁶ Thus, our data covers a period between 2011 and 2015. Data from the three rounds were merged and we ended up with 4811 observations. Basically, pooled data analysis has been carried out. Design weights are used in the data. We also conducted 55 interviews with university students to investigate what they think about the concept of democracy⁷. The face to face structured interviews were made after the end of the quantitative survey (July 2015).⁸

In order to identify active university and college students we ran K-Means cluster analysis by using 11 standardized normal variables. Via cluster analysis we analyzed political attitudes, ideological orientations of college and university students related to different dimensions of citizenship. We included

⁶During the first round of the research between December 2011- February 2012 an empirical survey was conducted with a hybrid technique: 1445 persons filled out an online survey at www.aktivfialok.hu through the website while another 255 persons were asked to answer questions via face-to-face interviews. The second round of the research happened in March–April of 2013. The survey was conducted with the hybrid technique: 859 persons filled out the online survey while another 441 persons were asked to answer questions via face-to-face interviews thus the sample consists of 1300 students. In April 2015 an empirical survey was conducted utilizing a sample of 800 students. All people were asked to answer questions via face-to-face interviews. Face-to-face interviews took place in 35 institutions across Hungary. Results were weighted for representativeness at a three-dimensional faculty-level. The aspects and considerations of weighting were: • The composition of the institution's faculty; • The distribution of men and women within the faculty; • The distribution of the levels of training within the institution and the faculty (university-college, BA, MA, undivided training, PhD).

⁷The original question was the following: *'In your own words, how would you define what democracy is?'*

⁸The semi-structured interviews were made in the yearly organized cultural event of university students (National Tourist Meeting of University and College Students). The respondents were 18–26 years old with different faculty of education. The data were collected during 5 days.

electoral participation (if the respondent has voted in last national election) and a combination of 7 indicators about non-electoral participation (signing a petition, collecting signatures for a petition, taking part in a lawful demonstration, taking part in unauthorized protest activity, boycotting products, taking part in any campaign activity, contacting politicians. We also included items measuring elements of respondent's normative views on the way how democracy works in Hungary ('democracy is better than every other political system' and 'under some conditions a dictatorship is better than democracy'; 'for people like me, one political system is just like any other') and respondent's satisfaction with the functioning of democracy. To measure the level of interest and active engagement of students in public life, we have measured 'interest in politics'; 'affiliation with any loose, open communities, movements' and 'being member of any online community that undertakes public affairs'. To measure if elements of the countries authoritarian past are still relevant and to test the coherence of students' view on democracy we have considered respondents agreement or disagreement on the following statements: 'The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience and respect for authority'; 'What our country needs is not so much laws and political programs, but, rather some brave, tireless, charismatic, and devoted leaders whom people can trust'; 'crime is in the blood of the Roma'.

Out of the great number of clusters ran we have selected the one that best fitted to the student population. We have chosen this method because we were looking for 'internal' dimensions that can reveal the collective consciousness of young people, and that can frame the way how they think about democratic citizenship.

6. Results

The K-Means cluster analysis has revealed 5 groups of Hungarian students (**Table 6-1**). It turned out that out of these 5 groups political activity is a constitutive element in two groups. Important result of the analysis is that positive attitudes towards democracy were present in three groups, whereas acceptance of dictatorship was present in two groups. Passive authoritarians are not only willing to accept authoritarian views but members of that group are also in favor of dictatorship.

Table 6-1. The proportion of students belonging to different categories

Name of the group	active democrats	conventional democrats	observer democrats	active authoritarians	passive authoritarians
share within the population (%)	8	15	26	15	36
Characteristics					
political interest	++	+	0	++	--
electoral participation	+	+	-	++	--
offline political activity	++	++	-	++	--
online political activity	++	+	0	+	-
democracy vs. dictatorship	+	0	++	-	--
satisfaction with democracy	-	-	0	++	0
authoritarianism	-	-	--	+	+
agreement on authoritarian views	-	-	--	+	++

Source: Own Calculation 2016, Active Youth in Hungary Research

Active democrats are the smallest group of Hungarian students (8%). Next to high level of political interest members of these group also have high level of political activity both online and offline. They are clearly in favor of democracy and they reject authoritarian views.

About 15 percent of Hungarian students belong to the group of conventional democrats. They are less interested in politics than active democrats and less active in electoral participation. They are less committed to democracy than the first group but they do have experience in offline political activities.

Observer democrats are the second largest group of students (26%). Observer democrats accept democracy as a system of rule and they reject authoritarian elements. But they have a passive, politically uninterested attitude and their participation in public life is low.

Active authoritarians are an interesting group of Hungarian students (15%). They are authoritarian and they endorse authoritarian views, democracy is not a value in itself for them. However they are the most satisfied with the way democracy works in Hungary. Members of this group are politically active, they are interested in politics and they are active both online and offline.

Finally the largest group (36%) of Hungarian students is the group of passive authoritarians. They agree with authoritarian views, they are in favor of dictatorship, but they are politically passive. They are the dissatisfied students who stay home and blame others for their problems.

In order to reveal the position of those five groups from different aspects of democracy we place them into two dimensional diagrams (**Figure 6-2** and **Figure 6-3**). Axis X is in both cases the left-right orientation of Hungarian students. On **Figure 6-2**, axis Y is their position on the liberal-conservative scale, whereas on **Figure 6-3**, axis Y shows their position on the moderate - radical scale. Scales had a value from 1-7 in all cases where 1 means that the respondent is leftist, liberal and moderate, and 7 expresses a rightist, conservative and radical position.

As it can be seen on both figures the group of active authoritarians is distinct from all other groups. They are right oriented, conservative and radical. They are on one wing of the two dimensional diagrams. The opposite wing is characterized by observer democrats. They have a leftist, liberal and moderate orientation. As for their ideological orientation conventional democrats and active democrats are very close to observer democrats.

Respondents of the passive authoritarian group are closer to democratic groups than to active authoritarians even though they tend to accept authoritarian views.

In sum, half of Hungarian students belong to democrats, whereas the other half are authoritarians. Only a small part of democrats are active. There is also a difference among authoritarians based on their political activity.




Figure 6-2.

Position of different categories of Hungarian students on the left/right and liberal/conservative scale (mean values of a 1–7 scale)

Mean value on left/right scale 4.37; on liberal/conservative scale: 3.69. Part between 2.5 and 6 highlighted in order to make differences more explicit among the groups. Source: Own Calculation 2016, Active Youth in Hungary Research




Figure 6-3.

Position of different categories of Hungarian students on the left/right and moderate/ radical scale (mean values of a 1–7 scale)

Mean value on left/right scale 4.37; on moderate/radical scale: 3.59. Part between 2.5 and 6 highlighted in order to make differences more explicit among the groups. Source: Own Calculation 2016, Active Youth in Hungary Research

7. Conclusion: Participation at Stake

In 1990 Orit Ichilov claimed that a country's democratization process, the mere existence of democratic institutions cannot guarantee that new generations growing up in democracy will think and act democratically. To challenge this idea we have chosen political events of 2012 and 2014 since those events provided ample evidence about Hungarian university students' political participation. Both events had influence on the government: the extent of cuts in the state subsidies to finance college tuition was modified and the proposal to include the taxation of Internet usage in the Taxation Law was abolished. But when asking students about the concept of democracy, participative interpretation of democracy was not present in their answers. Our aim was to find out how political participation is related to Hungarian university students' attitudes towards democracy and to answer whether and in what sense the above mentioned statement is true for the Hungarian case.

Our analysis has verified our expectations that participative elements of democratic culture do not appear among a great part of Hungarian students' attitudes. It has revealed a high percentage of passive students. We have found that the largest group (36%) of Hungarian students - we call them passive authoritarians - agree with authoritarian views and are in favor of dictatorship, but they are politically passive. We have found that 26 percent of our sample, namely observer democrats, accept democracy as a system of rule and they reject authoritarian elements. But they have a passive, politically uninterested attitude and their participation in public life is low. About 15 percent of Hungarian students belong to the group of conventional democrats. Although they are to some extent committed to democracy and they do have some experience in offline political activities, they are not very interested in politics and not very active in electoral participation.

Our analysis has shown that political participation is a constitutive element only of a small group of Hungarian students' collective consciousness. We have found that active democrats are the smallest group of Hungarian students (8%). They are clearly in favor of democracy, they reject authoritarian views and they have high level of political activity both online and offline. What is interesting that we have also identified the group of 'active authoritarians' (15 percent of our sample). Members of this group are politically active, they are interested in politics and they are active both online and offline. However they endorse authoritarian views, for them democracy is not a value in itself and they are the most satisfied with the way democracy works in Hungary.

From our results we can draw the conclusion that the statement of Ichilov might be true for the Hungarian case. The existence of democratic institutions is a necessary but not satisfactory condition of citizens' democratic attitudes.

Reasons behind the lacking participative interpretation of democracy and the high percentage of passive groups could probably be found in the Hungarian educational system. As Zsuzsa Mátrai has argued the established Hungarian education model 'represents the citizen attitude where the individual is not a participant but rather an observer of the processes' (Mátrai 1999:50-61). Further research is needed to see more clearly why participation remains a less emphasized element of democratic citizenship in Hungary.

Appendix 1.

List of variables

Variable	Contents	Comments
electoral participation	If parliamentary elections were to be held this Sunday (and you would be eligible to vote)?	I would certainly vote; =5 I would certainly not vote=0
offline participation index	It consists of the following variables: 1. Contacted politicians 2. Worked in an organization or association last 12 months; 3. Worn or displayed campaign badge/sticker last 12 months, 4. Campaign activity (e.g. Gluing posters) 5. Signed petition last 12 months; 6. Taken part in lawful public demonstration last 12 months; 7 Boycotted certain products last 12 months.	(values: 0–7)
online participation index		(values: 0–5)
Democracy	Democracy is better than every other political system. For people like me, one political system is just like any other. Dictature...	(values: 0-4)
Satisfaction with democracy	How satisfied with the way democracy works in country	I am not at all satisfied = 0 I am completely satisfied=4
Political interest (Pol_intr: name of variable in the table)	How interested in politics?	4=interested, 0= not interested
activity in community life	Are you affiliated with any loose, open communities, movements?	1=yes, 0= no
membership in online communities	Are you a member of any online community that undertakes public affairs?	1=yes, 0= no
Authoritarianism 1	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience and respect for authority	disagreement= 5 agreement= 0
Authoritarianism 2	What our country needs is not so much laws and political programs, but, rather some brave, tireless, charismatic, and devoted leaders whom people can trust	disagreement= 5 agreement= 0
Intolerance	Crime is in the blood of the Roma	disagreement= 5 agreement= 0

Appendix 2

	Cluster				
	Active democrats	Conventional democrats	Observer democrats	Active authoritarians	Passive authoritarians
Political interest	0,56768	0,22632	0,06547	0,69896	-0,5214
Offline participation	0,90203	0,85965	-0,33171	0,51266	-0,51215
Electoral participation	0,4164	0,29499	0,07729	0,61684	-0,4797
Online participation	0,97923	0,37162	-0,13071	0,44108	-0,4325
Activity in community life	0,69736	2,04423	-0,47796	-0,41006	-0,45013
Membership in online communities	3,44015	-0,29062	-0,29062	-0,29062	-0,27836
Democracy	0,26249	0,17105	0,72052	-0,18803	-0,55015
Satisfaction with democracy	-0,15368	-0,30735	-0,00182	0,91054	-0,14015
Authoritarianism 1	-0,34598	-0,28374	-0,51061	0,44387	0,41567
Authoritarianism 2	-0,34801	-0,22152	-0,62974	0,3613	0,51161
Intolerance	-0,34817	-0,23296	-0,53608	0,16545	0,31333

References

- Abowitz, K.K. –Harnish, J. (2006): Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship. In.: Review of Educational Research , 2006 vol. 76 no. 4.
- Amadeo, J. –Tornay-Purta, J. & Lehmann, R. &Husfeldt, V. &Nikolova, R. (2001): Civic Knowledge and Engagement An IEA Study of Upper Secondary Students in Sixteen Countries.IEA, 2001.
- Arnot, M. (1997): 'Gendered Citizenry': new feminist perspectives on education and citizenship. In.: British Educational Research Journal Volume 23, Issue 3, June 1997 275–295 pp.
- Barber, B. (1991): The Civic Mission of the University. In.: B. Murchland. Dayton (ed.) (1991): Higher Education and the practice of democratic politics. Dayton, Ohio: The Kettering Foundation, 1991.
- Barnett, R. (1997): Recovering the Civic University. In.: Lorraine McClrath & Iain MacLabhrainn (eds.) (1997): Higher Education and Civic Engagement: International Perspectives. Routledge, 1997.
- Biesta, G. (2009): What kind of citizen for European Higher Education? Beyond the competent active citizen. In.: European Educational Research Journal, Vol. 8. 2009, pp.146-157.
- Bihari, M. (2005): *Magyar politika 1944-2004*. Politikai éshatalmiviszonyok.[Politics in Hungary 1944-2004. Politics and Power] Budapest, Osiris.
- Crick, B. (2000): Essays on Citizenship. Bloomsbury Academic, 2000.
- Dekker, H. (1996): Democratic citizen competence: Political psychological and political socialization research perspectives. In.: Henk Dekker, Russell F. Farnen, Daniel B. German, Rudiger Meyenberg (eds) (1996), Palgrave MacMillan.
- Ehrlich, T. (2000): Civic Responsibility and Higher Education. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.
- Enslin, P. (2000) 'Defining a civic agenda: citizenship and gender equality in post-apartheid education', in M. Arnot and J. Dillabough (eds)(v.i.).
- Faulks, K. (2000): Citizenship. Routledge Publisher, 2000.
- Finkel, S. E. (2013): The impact of adult civic education programmes in developing democracies. UNU/WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/0 64.
- Finkel, S. E. & Smith, A. E. (2011): 'Civic Education, Political Discussion, and the Social Transmission of Democratic Knowledge and Values in a New Democracy: Kenya 2002.' American Journal of Political Science, 55(2): 417 – 435.
- Galston, W. (1991): Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Galston, W. (2001): Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. In: Annual Review of Political Science 2001, Vol. 4. pp. 217-234.
- Green, D. P. –Aronow, P. M & Bergan, D. E. & Greene, P. & Paris, C. & Weinberger, B.I. (2011): Does Knowledge of Constitutional Principles Increase Support for Civil Liberties? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment. In.: The Journal of Politics 73(02): 463–476.
- Gutmann, A. – Thompson, T. (1996): *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, Mass.:Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Hoskins, B. –Mascherini, M. 2009.'Measuring Active Citizenship through the Development of a Composite Indicator.' Journal of Social Indicator Research. 90 (3) 459-488.
- Ichilov, O. (1990): Political socialization, citizenship education, and democracy. Teachers College Press, 1990.
- Kymlicka, W. – Norman, W. (1994): Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. In.: Ethics 104 (2):352-381 (1994)
- Laki, L. – Szabó, A (2014): Milyen a magyar fiatalokdemokráciászkepszisemögött? In: Szabó, A (ed): *Racionálisan lázadó hallgatók II*. Belvedere Meridionale – MTA TK PTI, Budapest – Szeged pp. 21–42.
- Mátrai, Zs. (1999): In Transit Civic Education in Hungary. In.: Judith Tornay -Purta & John Schwillé & Jo-Ann Amadeo (eds) (1999): Civic Education Across Countries. IEA 1999.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992): Citizenship, Diversity and Education: a philosophical perspective. Journal of Moral Education, Volume 21, 1992 - Issue 3.
- Naval, C. –Print, M. & Veldhuis, R. (2002): Education for Democratic Citizenship in the New Europe: Context and Reform. In.: European Journal of Education, Volume 37, Issue 2 June 2002, 107–128 pp.
- Néron, P. – Norman, W. (2008): Citizenship, inc.: Do we really want businesses to be good corporate citizens? In.: Business Ethics Quarterly 18 (1):1-26 (2008)

- Nussbaum, M. (2002): Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection. In.: *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 21 (4/5), pp. 289-303.
- Nyüsti, Sz. (2010): Területkülönbségek a magyarfiatalokdemokrácia-értelmezésében. [Regional differences in young Hungarians understanding of democracy] In.: *ÚjIfjúságiSzemle* 2010/tél. pp. 65-78.
- Pangle, T. L. (1988): *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism*. The University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Pateman, C. (1988): *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Rosaldo, R. (1997): Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism. In: William V. Flores & Rina Benmayor (eds.) (1997): *Latino Cultural Citizenships*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- Shapiro, H. T. (2005): *A Larger Sense of Purpose: Higher Education and Society*. Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Sunstein, C. R. (1988): Beyond the Republican Revival. In.: *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 97, No. 8, Symposium: The Republican Civic Tradition (Jul., 1988), pp. 1539-1590.
- Szabó, A. (ed) (2015): *Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect Political. Attitudes of Hungarian University and College Students*. Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Prague 2015.
- Szabó, I. (2000): *A pártállamgyermekai*. [Children of the state party] Budapest, ÚjMandátumKönyvkiadó.
- Szabó, I. (2009): *Nemzetésszocializáció. A politikaszerepeazidentitásokformálódásábanMagyarországon 1867–2006*. [Nation and Socialization. The role of politics in shaping identities in Hungary 1867-2006] Budapest: L'Harmattan.
- Szabó, I. (2012): *Az egyetem, mint szocializációs színtér*. [The university as a terrain of socialization] In: Dusa Ágnes, Kovács Klára, Márkus Zsuzsanna, Nyüsti Szilvia, Sörös Anett (eds.): *Egyetemi élethelyzetek. Ifjúságszociológiai tanulmányok* I. Debrecen, Egyetemi Kiadó. p. 191–218.
- Veugelers, W. (2007): Creating critical-democratic citizenship education: empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. In.: *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Volume 37, 2007 pp. 105-119.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004): What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. In.: *American Educational Research Journal*; Summer 2004, Vol. 41. pp. 237-269.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997): *Gender and Nation*. SAGE Publications Ltd., 1997.

Open Access

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.