

# **POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION: HOW YOUR PARENTS' VALUES INFLUENCE YOUR POLITICAL PARTICIPATION**

**Staša Kolar\***

**Tina Rupar\*\***

\* Faculty of Social Sciences,  
University of Ljubljana  
Kardeljeva ploščad 5, 1000 Ljubljana  
Sociology, 3<sup>rd</sup> year of Bachelor's study  
stasa.kolar@gmail.com

\*\* Faculty of Social Sciences,  
University of Ljubljana  
Kardeljeva ploščad 5, 1000 Ljubljana  
Sociology, 3<sup>rd</sup> year of Bachelor's study  
tina.rupar@gmail.com

**Key words:**

family, political participation, political socialization, values

**Ključne riječi:**

obitelj, politička participacija, politička socijalizacija, vrijednosti

## Introduction

“Relationships are all there is. Everything in the universe exists because it is in relationship to everything else. Nothing exists in isolation” (Wheatley, 2009: 23). From the moment of birth, human beings are in contact with their peers and, first and foremost, family members. The family unit constitutes the primary point of contact, whether composed of a mother and father, parents of either gender, grandparents, or other primary caretakers. These figures are instrumental in regulating our behavior from birth onwards, representing us as an economic unit, providing emotional support, and playing a pivotal role in primary socialization. During this period, fundamental social values are imparted to children, exerting a substantial influence on their subsequent development (Moore, 1995). The present article explores the significance of the values acquired during childhood within their family units for their sustained engagement in political actions. This theoretical investigation explores the link between family values and involvement in different kinds of political participation.

The initial focus of this study will be an exploration of the relationship between the concept of family and values, and the subsequent transmission of these values to offspring. The importance of primary socialization will be examined, as well as the theory of

moral development. The subsequent stage of the investigation will focus on political engagement, encompassing an examination of diverse forms of participation and an analysis of the values held by individuals engaged in such movements. Finally, we will synthesize the theoretical concepts from both fields to address the aim of this article, which is to question the impact of family transmitted values on political participation.

## Family

The conceptualization and definition of family have been researched and problematized by the scientific community in an attempt to detach harmful ideological notions and make it more inclusive. To circumvent any potential ambiguity, this article aligns with the sociological conception of family, wherein the parental relationship is identified as the fundamental element. As Nowotny, Fux, and Pinelli (2004: 28) wrote, “a family is defined as a group of people living in a shared household and consisting of at least one child and at least one adult. The members of this community are connected either by marriage or cohabitation and parental relationship” (as cited in Renner et al., 2006: 16). Moreover, Moor’s work (1995) focuses exclusively on two categories of family, namely nuclear and extended, a perspective with which we concur. The term “extended family” is understood to denote any family structure comprising at least three generations, whereas “nuclear family” is defined as a relationship between two generations. From the standpoint of our research, the primary element constituting a family unit is the nurturance of the child. Consequently, the presence of specific individuals during the primary socialization of the subject is of paramount importance.

There are a number of approaches to study the transfer of values to children, depending on the perspective adopted in the examination of the issue. A prominent approach is the examination of primary socialization, defined as “the process through which individuals acquire behaviors that are regarded as conventional within societal norms” (Moore, 1995:8). This period is characterized by the complete dependency of children on their parents, with limited

interaction with other members of society. In such a context, the child's learning process is principally dependent on the imitation of parental models, which serve as the primary source of social norms and behaviors that are considered acceptable within the context of the wider society (Moore, 1998). The family's fundamental role, prior to the child's entry into the broader societal environment, is to transmit a range of skills, beliefs, and values to the younger generation. This process of learning, whether intentional or unintentional, is a crucial aspect of child development (Macionis, 2001).

According to Nickerson (2024), values are, in its basic form, “a belief /.../ about the way something should be”. The author extends on this simplistic definition of values by defining social values from a psychological perspective, which she describes as “the beliefs, attitudes, and opinions about what is important, both to us and to society as a whole.” Therefore, values can provide the source of motivation for political participation, whereas an individual's behavioral traits, their social, economic, and cultural factors of their surroundings can be an indicator of their civic and political action (Vecchione et al., 2015), or of manifest and latent political participation, to use Ekman and Amnå's (2012) conceptualization, which we will extend on later. This is why the study of both is necessary here.

In 1981, Lawrence Kohlberg published a seminal theory in the field of moral development. According to the author, during early childhood (ages 3 to 7 (McLeod, 2024)), the first phase, pre-conventional, occurs when the child experiences stimuli in two ways: as pain and pleasure (Kohlberg, 1981, as cited in Macionis, 2001). At the pre-conventional level, two distinct stages of moral development can be identified. In the first stage, children exhibit obedience as a means of avoiding punishment and avoiding parental discipline. In the subsequent stage, which is characterized by the pursuit of personal benefits, children engage in specific tasks due to the belief that they will receive a reward (McLeod, 2024). In the second phase (Kohlberg, 1981, as cited in Macionis, 2001), otherwise referred to as conventional (from 8 to 13 years of age (McLeod, 2024)), individuals begin to discard their initial sense of selfishness and instead start to engage with the concepts of right and wrong, along with the broader cultural context (Kohlberg, 1981, as cited in Macionis,

2001). The initial premise pertains to the fulfilment of social expectations, a phenomenon exemplified by an individual undertaking a task with the objective of being perceived in a particular manner by their peers, family, or other societal constituents. In the following section, the focus is on a stage that describes situations in which an individual complies with the law for the purpose of maintaining social order (McLeod, 2024). It is only in the final phase, the postconventional level, which typically occurs in adulthood, that individuals move away from their familiar, established norms and begin to incorporate abstract concepts such as freedom and justice into their thinking (Kohlberg, 1981, as cited in Macionis, 2001).

As Haidt (2012: 18) writes, “politics and religion are expressions of our moral psychology.” Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is therefore crucial for understanding how parents’ values can influence their children’s values, because the stages of moral development dictate children’s ethical decisions, their perception of society, and their related behaviors. Kohlberg is widely regarded as a seminal figure in the field of moral development, having laid the foundation for his contemporaries, who have also introduced the element of interaction with the environment into the field, including political institutions. The latter permits the location of moral development at the intersection of micro- and macro-levels, thereby conferring an additional advantage upon the theory in comparison with other approaches. Despite its extensive use in numerous fields, it remains a relatively basic conceptual instrument (Wilson, 1981).

Earlier researchers believed that the individual’s political socialization is determined in the early stages of their life (Percheron, 1993, as cited in Guillemot and Price, 2017; Flanagan and Sherrod, 1998), whereas later research showed that during adolescence we examine membership in our families and question the authority of parents, and early adult years are the politically defining period because that’s when society replaces the family as the source of examination (Keniston, 1968, as cited in Flengan and Sherrod, 1998). Mannheim (1952, as cited in Flengan and Sherrod, 1998) claims this is due to the fact they are not yet fully integrated into societal roles and responsibilities, which allows them to experiment and question the conditions of the social order.

# Political participation

There is an ongoing debate among researchers about what constitutes political participation and how the definition should change and adapt to its new forms. Van Deth (2014, as cited in Weiss, 2020:3) offers four main characteristics which can indicate political participation: “it is an activity; it is voluntary and not ordered by a ruling class or required by law; it refers to people in their role as non-professionals or amateurs; and it concerns government, politics, or the state.” We would also adhere to the notion that political participation includes actions targeting policymaking processes, as well as services provided by governments, institutions, organizations or NGOs (such as education and healthcare) (Pattie et al., 2004, Fox, 2014, as cited in Weiss, 2020). Thus, political participation encompasses voting, joining parties, campaign activity, contacting public officials, cooperative or communal activities, attending protests, strikes and signing petitions (Verba and Nie, 1972, as cited in Weiss, 2020). Some authors, such as Rojas and Puig-i-Abril (2009:90, as cited in Weiss, 2020:3), support adding “subdimensions” to the definition of political participation, which include online participation, while some are wary about overstretching the term.

Ekman and Amnå (2012) noticed the overlapping and confusing use of the terms political participation and civic engagement among researchers and in everyday life. Having done a thorough theoretical overview on the definitions in use, they developed a new comprehensive typology. Ekman and Amnå (2012) discuss manifest and latent political participation, where the former refers to the public, the political or the market domain, and the latter refers to civic participation. Manifest political participation is where citizens exercise the political rights that come with citizenship; this includes formal political participation (e.g. voting, unionizing) and activism or extra-parliamentary participation (e.g. signing petitions, attending protests) (Ekman & Amnå, 2012:292, 295–296). In short, activism refers to an “action taken challenging those in power to bring about change in society and benefit the greater good” (Brooks, 2023, para. 1). In the market domain, manifest political participation

refers to critical consumption (e.g. boycotts). Civic or latent political participation refers to activities within the civil domain (Ekman & Amnå, 2012:296). Under this term the authors differentiate civic engagement or action (e.g. recycling, activity within community based organizations) and social involvement or attention (e.g. taking interest in politics, identifying with a certain ideology, even veganism). Ekman and Amnå (2012) argue that it is necessary to include the latency component, otherwise important aspects of political behavior will be systematically overlooked. Both latent and manifest political participation have individual and collective forms, as apparent with given examples. Abstaining from any mentioned activity is also deemed political. Politics is considered to be any activity of the people that reproduces the kind of political community we have. This is why democracies are considered to be healthier, better and of a higher degree when political participation is high (Lukšič, 2022). Two forms of disengagement or non-participation can be identified: passive or apolitical forms (e.g. perceiving politics as uninteresting and unimportant, non-reflected lifestyles) and active or antipolitical forms (e.g. avoiding talking about politics, deliberately taking part in non-political lifestyles, such as hedonism) (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). At the very least, this suggests that being apolitical is inherently political and that political participation is necessary in maintaining a democratic society.

The state of democratic societies reflects this. A slightly dated research from the sixties showed that only 7% of individuals are politically active, 60% could be categorized as observers and 30% are inactive or numb (Milbrath, 1965, as cited in Lukšič, 2022).

Given the large intervals among percentages, we were curious as to what influences people's political participation and wanted to take a closer look at some of the possible factors. According to a study conducted across 28 countries in four continents, which comprised 42,000 participants, political (dis)engagement is coherent with personal values, which are a more tangible yet not the sole indicator of political (dis)engagement in comparison to gender, age, education and income (Vecchione et al., 2015). The results of the study found that values of self-transcendence and openness to change were positively related to political participation, whereas

values of conservation and conformity, which reflect compliance with external expectations and avoidance of disrupting behavior, have been linked to political disengagement (Vecchione et al., 2015). The study, although not self-proclaimed as such, uses a “value-based approach” (Živoder, 2022), meaning it analyzes political activism (which is here understood as subjective experiences of addressing and challenging social norm) (Flyvbjerg, 2001, Lambert, 2010, Sayer, 2011, Dave, 2012, as cited in Živoder, 2022) through values, (i.e. a set of meanings and practices that express care to the world), focusing on the importance of affect and ethics (Živoder, 2022). People’s basic values are typically stable across time (Schwartz, 2006, as cited in Vecchione et al., 2015) and various life transitions (Bardi et al., 2014, as cited in Vecchione et al., 2015). The same cannot be said about people’s political participation, which is often situational, episodic and dependent on the personal importance of political issues (Norris, 2004, as cited in Vecchione et al., 2015), as well as lifecycles and personal constraints which affect the costs and risk of participating (McAdam, 1986, as cited in Weiss, 2020).

The state of the global economy is also a notable indicator for increasing people’s interest in civic affairs. For example, fewer opportunities for secure employment and increasing economic disparities naturally produce civic disaffection, and are causal of the lack of trust in political leaders and the subsequent threat of political stability, which mobilizes people to participate in civic – as well as political, we would argue – affairs (Flanagan and Sherrod, 1998). This “development” of the economy (cutting social welfare, prioritizing private wealth over the commonwealth, individualism etc.) and its globalization also directly influence young adults who are attempting to transition into the labor market (Flanagan and Sherrod, 1998); this effect is mostly negative.

Many studies have shown that young people have the lowest engagement in voting in elections and membership in political parties (i.e. traditional political participation), which is often interpreted as a result of the youth’s disinterest and disengagement with politics and their general apathy toward political topics. However, “citizens becoming increasingly disengaged from traditional channels of

political participation is a trait of post-industrial societies” (Dalton, 1998, Norris, 1999, Skocpol and Fiorina, 1999, Dalton, 2006, as cited in Ekman & Amnå, 2012:283). The aforementioned traditional models are being replaced with new forms of political participation (such as online and non-institutionalized participation), which are increasingly emerging, most frequently among youth, also on account of young people having fewer opportunities to participate politically (Weiss, 2020). Furthermore, research has shown that young adults define political participation much narrower than adults and researchers, which also influences reports on “low” youth's political participation (Weiss, 2020). As Rainsford (2017, as cited in Weiss, 2020:5) concluded “it seems as if the problem of youth political participation is less a matter of whether they participate, and more a matter of where they participate.”

## **Family transmitted values in the context of political participation**

The theory of political socialization began to develop in the late 1950s, when Hyman's work *Political Socialization* was published. Subsequent to this seminal moment, the theory has disseminated extensively and assumed numerous forms. Despite the numerous theoretical orientations within the field, there is a consensus among scientists that the family constitutes a pivotal agent of (political) socialization. However, the scope of this phenomenon remains to be thoroughly researched. It is challenging to propose a singular theory of political socialization; however, it can be posited that this concept pertains to the initial phase of an individual's life, during which they are influenced by a multitude of external factors that shape their subsequent development and engagement in political matters (Niemi & Sobieszek, 1977).

The theory of political socialization focuses on “intergenerational stability of political loyalty to study the developmental processes of children becoming members of political communities” (Flana-

gan and Sherrod, 1998:448). Studies on political socialization are mostly limited to youth, thus failing to encompass changeability of life course (Nolas et al., 2017a, as cited in Živoder, 2022), political direction (Linden & Klandermans, 2007, as cited in Živoder, 2022) and political participation (Fisher, 2012, Nolas et al., 2017, as cited in Živoder, 2022). Political participation can be triggered for the first time later in life (Guillemot & Price, 2017), therefore a life course approach on the topic is more than advised.

Živoder's (2022) argument posits that the study of political participation frequently subordinates and neglects the analysis of everyday life, which includes family life. In underscoring the relevance of domestic issues, particularly within the context of public affairs, the author herself acknowledges the significance of the saying "the personal is political," which was historically associated with feminist movements. This slogan signifies that even the mundane everyday routines of our personal lives, which are so often devoid of critical thought, are political, due to the fact they illustrate our social environments, social values, norms, expectations, and ethical standpoints. These activities are ones we are inherently involved in, and therefore we believe a critical analysis of their political effect is imperative (Živoder, 2022). Having established that personal everyday life is political, examining the relationships we grow up with and encounter every day is the sensible next step.

As we are researching the impact of family transmitted values on political participation and as it is known that political ideas and perspectives are the product of social relations and activities engaged in during development (Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998), we wanted to delve into how this occurs.

Research in Slovenia has observed shifts in young people's political participation. Whilst it is commonly assumed that this signifies a shift in terms of political passivity, in reality it constitutes merely an alteration in motivation and approach to politics. Research carried out at the Centre for Social Psychology and Youth Studies at the Faculty of Social Sciences (1993, 1995, 1998, 2000) has shown that young people do not primarily form their moral orientation by

relying on the world's great ideologies; rather, they draw their allegiances from their everyday lives and experiences in their private lives. The prevailing assumption that young people are politically passive is arguably rooted in their disengagement from established political institutions, leading to a focus on more individualized and sometimes egocentric concerns and political actions. When this phenomenon is considered in conjunction with the rising trend of prolonged residence within the family home, the strengthening of familial bonds, and the growing reliance on the family unit, a more comprehensive picture begins to emerge regarding the significance of the interplay among family, values, and political engagement (Mencin Čepлак, 2002).

Scholars have stressed the importance of the family as a fundamental socialization agency driving the children's social and political attitudes, orientations, and behaviors (Hess & Torney, 1969, as cited in Quaranta & Dotti Sani, 2016), and many studies have found similarities between parents and children in terms of political engagement (Niemi & Hepburn, 1995, as cited in Quaranta & Dotti, 2016), civic behaviors (Andolina et al., 2003, as cited in Quaranta & Dotti Sani, 2016), attitudes (Jennings et al., 2009, as cited in Quaranta & Dotti, 2016), and values (Westholm, 1999, as cited in Quaranta & Dotti Sani, 2016). The validity of these theories is reinforced by a comprehensive investigation encompassing 394 families, including both biological and adopted children, with an average age of approximately 32 years at the time of the study. Willoughby et al. (2021) found that both biological and external factors, including parenting and parent-child relationships, contribute to political attitudes. Consequently, political attitudes that are consistent with those of the parents are also perceived in the non-biological children in the study. Parental influence is not merely present; it extends profoundly into the adult life of the offspring, manifesting predominantly in the domains of egalitarianism and political orientation (Willoughby et al., 2021).

Additionally, research highlighting the importance of an intersectional approach has been concluded. A study of family transmitted political characteristics among people of color points out that they "feel less politically efficacious throughout multiple genera-

tions” (García, 1973, Abramson, 1977, as cited in Weiss, 2020). Furthermore, in analyzing differences between American and French families it has been concluded that “... the object of partisan socialization within the family is country specific” (Percheron and Jennings, 1981:434, as cited in Weiss, 2020:5).

Vargas (2008: 2–3) provides a compelling illustration of the impact of familial relationships on activism and political involvement, drawing upon personal experience to offer a nuanced perspective on the role of relationships in social engagement. The subject provides a detailed account of his recollections concerning his aunt, who was known for her support of his vision for community enhancement:

Let me tell you a little more about myself and my family /.../. When I was eight years old, I escorted my Tia Fina home /.../. There was no sidewalk /.../, so I struggled to push my little cousin's baby carriage along the dirt path. Suddenly, a thought came to mind that I proudly shared with my auntie /.../. She listened, and I felt her profoundly considering my declaration. She responded, “Aye, gracias, mijo (thank you, my son), but a sidewalk would be so expensive, how will you pay for it?” By the tone of her voice, I felt she had no doubt in my conviction, so I continued sharing and developing my vision in response to her occasional, but strategic questions. Our conversation ensued, and before we arrived at her home, I knew that my life's work would be to make the world better. /.../ I had connected with my purpose!

It is evident that the aunt's support played a pivotal role in subject's identification of his purpose, which he subsequently pursued with unwavering commitment. The subject's narrative, which is both detailed and exhaustive, provides a compelling illustration of how a single interaction within the family environment has the capacity to exert a profound and long-lasting influence on the life of the child, extending even into their adult years. The intent behind this interaction, whether to stimulate the young person's interest in social change or simply to demonstrate that he was listened to and his ideas were acknowledged, has had a profound impact on the beliefs that the author holds today. The values imparted by his aunt have had a profound impact on the author's decision to become

an activist and on his subsequent involvement in different social activities (Vargas, 2008).

The finding that there is a continuity between the political orientation of parents and their offspring on both the left and right of the political spectrum is not a new phenomenon, having been present since the late 1960s (Solomon & Fishman, 1964, Westb & Braungart, 1966, Keniston, 1968, as cited in Dunlap, 1970). Consequently, numerous studies have confirmed the “political socialization hypothesis” (Dunlap, 1970). Later studies include a value component in the observation of political participation. The argument is thus made that the study of values in the political domain can be crucial for identifying the motivational factors that drive people to mobilize for political participation. An analysis of the Italian electorally active population reveals that individuals who embrace universalism or security values are more likely to cast their vote in elections, while hedonism values predominate among those who do not participate in elections (Vecchione et al., 2015). Although the latter study does not include the family component, it demonstrates a correlation between personal values and political activism.

However, a study conducted by the Pew Research Center in the United States incorporates this family component. It was determined that parents in America do not attach significant importance to the transmission of their own political affiliation to their offspring. However, research findings indicated that, while they may not prioritize the alignment of their children's political leanings with their own, they nevertheless exert an influence in this regard, often subconsciously. To illustrate this phenomenon, consider the following statistic: approximately 80% of parents who self-identify as Republican also have children who share the same political affiliation. This figure is even higher among Democrats, where approximately nine in ten parents have children with the same political orientation (Pew Research center, 2023).

An additional important component to political and civic participation is a sense of social responsibility, the development of which is largely the role of the family (Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998). An even stronger sentiment shared by the politically active is perceived in-

justice and the outrage norm, which have proved to positively influence group efficacy as well (Thomas & McGarty, 2009, as cited in Smith, 2021).

## Conclusion

This concise review of pertinent literature offers an extensive overview of the relationship between values, family, and political participation, highlighting its multifaceted nature and the diverse research approaches that could be adopted to explore it. It is evident that the influence of genetics, parenting, environment, and external factors is of paramount importance in the shaping of values. These values, in turn, exert a significant influence on political activity, passivity, and other political characteristics.

A review of the extant literature reveals a strong relationship between parental influence and their children's value systems, with these value systems in turn exerting a notable impact on the degree of political participation of the children. This phenomenon, whether conscious or subconscious, is compliant with - and has been demonstrated to exist by the findings of numerous studies - Kohlberg's theory of moral development, which illustrates the stages of moral development and their dependence on our social surroundings; Mannheim's interpretation of political socialization, where he refers to the switch from familial to societal examination as the critical turning point in a person's political socialization; and Vygotsky's findings, which show that political thoughts are dependent on the social activities and relations, which we engage in during development. While a relationship is evident, it is imperative to emphasize that parents and upbringing are not the sole external factors influencing this phenomenon. The time and place in which an individual is raised is also of significance, with cultural factors exerting a substantial influence.

A further notable finding pertains to the long-term stability and consistency of the values imparted by parents to their offspring. Values are defined as long-lasting and stable characteristics of the individual; however, this does not imply that their expression

is uniform. Consequently, while values may persist and reproduce well into an individual's adult life, their political participation may undergo change. It is evident that the life course perspective is of paramount importance in order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under investigation.

In reviewing the scientific literature, it became clear that there is a considerable degree of potential for further research and the development of existing research in the domain of family-transmitted values and political participation. First and foremost, in line with the findings, longitudinal studies are proposed. These should identify life cycle changes and thus capture a more authentic picture that reflects the link between values and political affiliation rather than affective action based on emotions. Furthermore, it is necessary to emphasize the significance of incorporating the cultural context into the research process, as this factor also exerts a substantial influence on the outcomes. Consequently, it is insufficient to simply consider the relationship between children and their parents along with their educational approach; the context in which a particular type of socialization takes place must also be considered.

It is important to acknowledge the numerous inconsistencies present within the extant literature concerning the incorporation of contemporary, newly emergent models of political participation, which are experiencing a surge in popularity among younger demographics. This perceived gap in the scientific literature underscores the importance of understanding how political participation is conceptualized by young people and what they themselves regard as political, as this leap can contribute to a shift in scientific findings.

## References

Brooks, E. (2023). What is Activism: Definition, Types, Role, Examples, Importance. *Liberties*. <https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/activism/44871> (3. 3. 2025.)

Dunlap, R. (1970). Radical and conservative student activists: A comparison of family backgrounds. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 13(3), 171–181.

Ekman, J., Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs (Bratislava, Slovakia)*, 22(3), 283–300. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1>

Flanagan, C. A., Sherrod, L. R. (1998). Youth political development: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 447–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.761998076>

Guillemot, J. R., Price, D. J. (2017). Politicisation in later life: experience and motivations of older people participating in a protest for the first time. *Contemporary Social Science*, 12(1–2), 52–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2017.1326620>

Haidt, J. (2012) *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Penguin books.

Lukšič, I. (2022). Politična participacija apolitičnih mladih. IN: Pušnik, T. and Banjac, M., Politična participacija znotraj mladih onkraj volitev: Konceptualni premisleki in izzivi proučevanja (1. elektronska izd.) (p. 77–294). Fakulteta za družbene vede: Založba FDV. [https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/docs/default-source/zalozba/zbornik---politicka-participacija-mladih\\_final\\_ebook.pdf?sfvrsn=2](https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/docs/default-source/zalozba/zbornik---politicka-participacija-mladih_final_ebook.pdf?sfvrsn=2)

Macionis, J. J. (2001). *Sociology* (8th ed.). Prentice Hall.

McLeod, S. (2024, 12 march). Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development. *Simply psychology*.

Mencin Čeplak, M. (2002). Mladi in prostori političnosti. *Socialna pedagogika*, 6(3), 239–253. <http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:doc-ZM6F7MIJ>

Moore, S. (1998). *Sociologija: ključni pojmi in dejstva* (Ponatis, Let. 1). Znanstveno in publicistično središče.

Nickerson, C. (2024, 13 february). Values Meaning In Sociology. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/values-definition-sociology.html>

Pew Research Center. (10. 5. 2023). *Most U.S. parents pass along their religion and politics to their children*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/05/10/most-us-parents-pass-along-their-religion-and-politics-to-their-children/> (22. 6. 2025)

Renar, T., Sedmak, M., Švab, A., in Urek, M. (2006). *Družina in družinsko življenje v Sloveniji*. <https://www.scribd.com/document/650557015/Druzine-in-Druzinsko-Zivljenje>

Niemi, Richard G., and Barbara I. Sobieszek. "Political socialization." *Annual review of sociology* 3 (1977): 209-233.

Quaranta, M., Dotti Sani, G. M. (2016). The Relationship Between the Civic Engagement of Parents and Children: A Cross-National Analysis of 18 European Countries. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(6), 1091–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016628677>

Smith, E. M., González, R., Frigolett, C. (2021). Understanding Change in Social-Movement Participation: The Roles of Social Norms and Group Efficacy. *Political Psychology*, 42(6), 1037–1051. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45419251>

Vargas, R. (2008). *Family Activism*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Incorporated.

Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Schoen, H., Cieciuch, J., Silvester, J., Bain, P., Bianchi, G., Kirmanoglu, H., Baslevant, C., Mamali, C., Manzi, J., Pavlopoulos, V., Posnova, T., Torres, C., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Vondráková, E., Welzel, C., Alessandri, G. (2015). Personal values and political activism: A cross-national study. *British Journal of Psychology*, 106(1), 84–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12067>

Weiss, J. (2020). What Is Youth Political Participation? Literature Review on Youth Political Participation and Political Attitudes. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2020.00001>

Wheatley, M. J. (2009). *Turning to one another: simple conversations to restore hope to the future* (Expanded 2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler. <http://nukweb.nuk.uni-lj.si/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?authtype=ip&direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=260771&lang=sl&site=eds-live>

Willoughby, E. A., Giannelis, A., Ludeke, S., Klemmensen, R., Nřrgaard, A. S., Iacono, W. G., Lee, J. J., McGue, M. (2021). Parent contributions to the development of political attitudes in adoptive and biological families. *Psychological Science*, 32(12), 2023–2034. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976211036798>

Wilson, R. W. (1981). Political socialization and moral development. *World Politics*, 33(2), 153-177.

Živoder, A. (2022). Politična participacija mladih skozi pristop življenjskega poteka. IN: Pušnik, T. in Banjac, M., Politična participacija znotraj mladih onkraj volitev: Konceptualni premisleki in izzivi proučevanja (1. elektronska izd.) (p. 248–276). Fakulteta za družbene vede: Založba FDV. [https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/docs/default-source/zalozba/zbornik---politicka-participacija-mladih\\_final\\_ebook.pdf?sfvrsn=2](https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/docs/default-source/zalozba/zbornik---politicka-participacija-mladih_final_ebook.pdf?sfvrsn=2)